







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

THE
THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

EXPLAINED WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, D.D.

VICAR OF LEEDS AND PREBENDARY OF WELLS
SOMETIME PRINCIPAL OF WELLS THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II
ARTICLES IX-XXXIX

METHUEN & CO.
36 ESSEX STREET, W.C.
LONDON

1897

PREFACE

FOR some years there has been a widely-spread feeling, among those whose work called them to lecture on the XXXIX. Articles, that there is room for another treatise on the subject. Archdeacon Hardwick's invaluable work is purely historical, and attempts no interpretation or Scriptural proof of the Articles themselves. Bishop Forbes' *Explanation* is excellent as a theological treatise, but, in spite of its title, it is scarcely an "explanation" of the Articles. Dr. Boulbee's *Theology of the Church of England* is clear and business-like, but it is written from a party point of view. Of Bishop Harold Browne's well-known *Exposition* it is sufficient to say that the first edition was published in 1850, and that a good deal of fresh light has been thrown upon the Articles during the last forty-six years. But since the Bishop was content to issue edition after edition without making any change in it, or subjecting it to a much-needed revision, the book, which has in the past been of so much service to the Church, has become in many parts (*e.g.* in all that concerns the history of the Creeds) antiquated and out of date. Since the present work was sent to the press, two other volumes on the same subject have appeared, namely, an *Introduction to the XXXIX. Articles*, by Dr. Maclear and Mr. Williams, and *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reforma-*

tion, by the Rev. E. Tyrrell Green,—a fact which affords striking evidence of the feeling alluded to above, that the text-books at present in use are not altogether adequate. Mr. Green's work contains much illustrative matter from contemporary documents, and that by Dr. Maclear and Mr. Williams is excellent as a short text-book. My own work is on a somewhat larger scale, and may perhaps appear to be more ambitious, in aiming at completeness as a commentary upon the Articles; and I trust that it may be found that there is room for it as well as for these others. My object throughout has been to make the work correspond as closely as possible to the title. It is not in any way intended to be a complete system of theology. The subjects discussed are strictly limited to those which are fairly suggested by the text of the Articles. Nor is it a history of doctrine. I have simply endeavoured to explain the teaching of the Articles, assuming a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history on the part of the reader, and only tracing out the history of doctrine where it seemed to be absolutely necessary in order to enable him to understand the meaning of the text of the Articles and the expressions used in it. My aim has always been to discover and elucidate the "plain, literal, and grammatical sense" of the document on which I have undertaken to comment. I can honestly say that I have striven to be perfectly fair, and to avoid the temptation to "read in" to the Articles meanings which I am not convinced to be really there. How far I have succeeded my readers must judge for themselves.

One possible criticism I should like to meet beforehand. It may perhaps be said that there is a lack of proportion in the treatment of the Articles, since far more space has been devoted to the first eight than to

the remaining thirty-one. My reply must be that the fault, if it be a fault, has been deliberately committed,—and for this reason. The first eight Articles practically re-state, in an enlarged form, the rule of faith as contained in the Church's Creed, and therefore stand on a different footing from the others. In some works on the Articles this seems to be regarded as a reason for devoting but little space to them, it being presumably taken for granted that the student will have previously mastered Pearson's great work, or some other treatise on the Creed. It has seemed to me wiser to adopt the opposite course, and to make the commentary upon them fuller than that on the remaining Articles, in order to emphasize their importance, and to give them their proper position. I trust, however, that the lack of proportion is not really so great as might at first sight appear. Many of the later Articles admit of very slight treatment, and I hope that it will be found that adequate attention has been paid to the really important ones among them, especially to those on the Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry.

It only remains for me to express my thanks to those who have assisted me in the work, especially to the Rev. A. Robertson, D.D., Principal of Hatfield Hall, Durham, who has kindly looked through the proof sheets, and helped me by making many valuable suggestions.

E. C. S. G.

THE VICARAGE, LEEDS,

December 10, 1896.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ARTICLE IX.—OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN	357
Original Sin	359
The Effect of Baptism in the removal of Original Sin	373
The Character of Concupiscence	375
ARTICLE X.—OF FREEWILL	378
Freewill	379
The Need of Grace	380
ARTICLE XI.—OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN	388
Justification : Its Meaning and Relation to Sanctification	389
The Meritorious Cause of Justification	397
The Instrument or Formal Cause of Justification	398
The “Homily of Justification”	407
ARTICLE XII.—OF GOOD WORKS	410
ARTICLE XIII.—OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION	415
The Title as compared with the Article itself	415
The Scholastic Theory of Congruous Merit	418
The Teaching of the Article upon the Subject	420
ARTICLE XIV.—OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION	424
The Name “Works of Supererogation”	425
The History of the Growth of the System of Indulgences	426
The Theological Defence offered for them	433
ARTICLE XV.—OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN	439
Christ’s Sinlessness	441
ARTICLE XVI.—OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM	444
The fact that deadly Sin is not Unpardonable	446
The possibility of falling from Grace	455

	PAGE
ARTICLE XVII.—OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION . . .	159
The Description of Predestination	465
The Steps which accompany it	481
The Practical Effect of the Doctrine	482
Two Considerations calculated to guard the Doctrine from Abuses	485
ARTICLE XVIII.—OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST	488
ARTICLE XIX.—OF THE CHURCH	493
The Description of the Visible Church	496
The Statement that the Church of Rome hath erred in Matters of Faith	506
ARTICLE XX.—OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH	511
The <i>Legislative</i> Power of the Church with regard to Rites or Ceremonies	514
The <i>Judicial</i> Authority of the Church with regard to Doctrine. .	520
The Office of the Church with regard to Holy Scripture . . .	526
ARTICLE XXI.—OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS	529
They may not be gathered together without the Consent of Princes	532
They are liable to Err	534
As a Matter of History they actually have Erred	535
ARTICLE XXII.—OF PURGATORY	537
Purgatory	542
Pardons	554
Adoration of Images and Reliques	557
Invocation of Saints	564
ARTICLE XXIII.—OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION	573
The Need of an External Call and Mission	575
The Description of those through whom the Call comes . . .	578
ARTICLE XXIV.—OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH	581
The Evidence of Scripture on this Subject	582
The Custom of the Primitive Church	583

CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
ARTICLE XXV.—OF THE SACRAMENTS	585
The Description of Sacraments ordained of Christ	588
The Number of such Sacraments	593
The Five Rites “commonly called Sacraments”	602
The Use of Sacraments	610
ARTICLE XXVI.—OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS	615
ARTICLE XXVII.—OF BAPTISM	620
The Description of Baptism and its Effects	621
Infant Baptism	634
ARTICLE XXVIII.—OF THE LORD’S SUPPER	641
The Description of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper	647
The Doctrine of Transubstantiation	649
The Nature of the Presence, and the “Mean whereby it is received”	660
Certain Practices in connection with the Eucharist	664
ARTICLE XXIX.—OF THE WICKED WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD’S SUPPER	668
ARTICLE XXX.—OF BOTH KINDS	676
The History of the Practice condemned in it	676
The Arguments by which it has been justified	683
ARTICLE XXXI.—OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST FINISHED UPON THE CROSS	687
The Sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross	688
The Condemnation of the “Sacrifices of Masses”	691
ARTICLE XXXII.—OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS	695
There is no Prohibition of the Marriage of the Clergy in Scripture	696
It is lawful for the Clergy to Marry if they think it advisable	697
ARTICLE XXXIII.—OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS: HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED	705
ARTICLE XXXIV.—OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH	716
ARTICLE XXXV.—OF HOMILIES	722
The History of the Homilies	723
The Nature of the Assent demanded to them	726

	PAGE
ARTICLE XXXVI.—OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS	729
The Objections of the Puritans	731
The Objections of the Romanists	748
ARTICLE XXXVII.—OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES	759
The Royal Supremacy	761
The Papal Claims	772
The Lawfulness of Capital Punishment	780
The Lawfulness of War	781
ARTICLE XXXVIII.—OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS WHICH ARE NOT COMMON	783
The Community of Goods	784
The Duty of Almsgiving	786
ARTICLE XXXIX.—OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH	788
INDEX	793

ARTICLE IX

De Peccato Originali.

Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium et depravatio naturæ cujuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati, qua fit ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet, ad malum sua natura propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat. Unde in unoquoque nascentium iram Dei atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis hæc naturæ depravatio, qua fit ut affectus carnis, Græce *φρόνημα σαρκός* (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium carnis interpretantur) legi Dei non subiciatur. Et quanquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus.

Of Original or Birth Sin.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

THE original object of this Article is shown very definitely by the words which in the Article of 1553 followed the reference to the Pelagians: "which also the Anabaptists do nowadays renew" (et hodie Anabaptistæ repetunt). These words, omitted at the revision of 1563 (possibly because the danger was less pressing), prove

that it was designed at least primarily to meet the revival of the Pelagian error on the subject of original sin by the Anabaptists.¹ A further object was probably to state the view of the Church of England on the effect of baptism in the removal of original sin, more particularly with regard to "concupiscence," which all parties admitted to remain in the regenerate, but concerning the character and precise nature of which widely differing views were advanced.

Except for the omission of the words just noticed, the Article has stood without substantial change since it was first drawn up in 1553.² It has been sometimes thought that its language is based on that used in the Confession of Augsburg; but the resemblance is very slight.³ Nor is it much closer to the corresponding Article in the Thirteen drawn up in 1538 by a joint committee of Anglicans and Lutherans, which does little more than

¹ The same error on the part of the Anabaptists is noticed in Hermann's *Consultation*: "Fyrste they denie originally synne, and they wyll not acknowledg howe greate filthynes, how greate impietie and even pestilent corruption was broughte upon us all thorowe the fall of Adame."—English translation of 1548, fol. cxlii.

² Two slight changes in the English should be noticed. Where our present Article uses the phrase "original righteousness," the Edwardian Article had "his former righteousness, which he had at his creation"; and instead of "inclined to evil" it had "given to evil." The alterations made at the revision of 1571 brought the English into closer conformity with the Latin.

³ "Item docent quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines secundum naturam propagati, nascentur cum peccato, hoc est sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum, et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic morbus, seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum. Damnant Pelagianos et alios qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum, et ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi disputant hominem propriis viribus rationis coram Deo justificari posse."—*Conf. August.* art. II. It will be noticed that the Anglican Article is far more guarded and cautious in its statements than this. See below, p. 376.

repeat the Lutheran formulary with the addition of a reference to the loss of original righteousness.¹ But though the language of our Article cannot be traced to any earlier source, the following passage from the *Reformatio Legum* illustrates its teaching, and points even more distinctly to the revival of the Pelagian heresy by a section of the Anabaptists:—

“In labe peccati ex ortu nostro contracta, quam vitium originis appellamus, primum quidem Pelagianorum, deinde etiam Anabaptistarum nobis vitandus et submovendus est error, quorum in eo consensus contra veritatem sacrarum Scripturarum est, quod peccatum originis in Adamo solo hæserit, et non ad posteros transierit, nec ullam afferat naturæ nostræ perversitatem, nisi quod ex Adami delicto propositum sit peccandi noxium exemplum, quod homines ad eandem pravitatem invitat imitandam et usurpandam. Et similiter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo solo sine alia speciali Christi gratia recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituent.”²

The principal subjects to be considered in connection with this Article are the following:—

1. Original sin.
2. The effect of baptism in the removal of original sin.
3. The character of concupiscence.

I. *Original Sin.*

Under this head there are various points which require elucidation—

(a) The phrase “original sin.”

(b) The Pelagian heresy, as showing what original sin is *not*.

¹ See Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 261.

² *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Hæres*, c. 7.

(c) Original righteousness, as that from which man is "very far gone."

(d) The effect of the Fall.

(a) *The phrase "original sin"* (Peccatum originale or peccatum originis).¹ This does not occur anywhere in Holy Scripture, but is due to S. Augustine, who makes use of it in one of his earlier works;² and from his day forward it is of frequent occurrence, being made current coin through the Pelagian controversy. The phrase was perhaps suggested to Augustine by the similar expression "originis injuriam" which had been used by S. Ambrose;³ while still earlier S. Cyprian had said of a new-born infant, "secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit."⁴

(b) *The Pelagian heresy, as showing what original sin is not.*

This heresy originated early in the fifth century. Its founder, Pelagius, was a monk of British extraction who had settled at Rome. There he took offence at the well-known saying of Augustine, "Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt," which seemed to him to exalt the Divine at the expense of the human in the work of salvation.⁵ Subsequently he and his friend and convert, Coelestius, elaborated the system which has since borne his name. His character may be seen from the charges which were brought against Coelestius at a Council held in 412 at Carthage, whither the two friends

¹ The two expressions are evidently regarded as convertible terms. The latter is used in the text of the Article, the former in the title.

² *Ad Simplicianum*, I. c. i. § 10.

³ *Apol. Proph. David*, i. § 56. Cf. Aug. *Contra duas Epist.* IV. § 29.

⁴ Ep. lxiv. Cf. Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine*, p. ix.

⁵ "Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis," Conf. X. c. xxix. Cf. *De dono persever.* c. xx., where Augustine himself refers to this fact.

had passed from Rome. The charges (to which Cœlestius returned evasive answers) were these:—

1. That Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned.

2. That his sin injured himself alone, and not the whole human race.

3. That infants at their birth are in the same condition in which Adam was before the Fall.

4. That unbaptized infants as well as others would obtain eternal life.

5. That mankind neither died through Adam's death or transgression, nor would rise again through Christ's resurrection.

6. That the law had the same effect as the gospel in leading men to the kingdom of heaven.

7. That even before Christ came there had been sinless men.¹

Of these tenets the second and third are the most important, as being most intimately connected with the whole system that was subsequently known as Pelagianism. They amount to (*a*) a denial that the fall of Adam had affected his descendants; and (*b*) closely connected with this "a denial of the necessity of supernatural and directly assisting grace in order to any true service of God on the part of man."² This latter seems to have been in the order of time prior to the first mentioned, which, however, is its ground and basis. Admit in any true sense the Fall, and Divine grace becomes a necessity. Deny the Fall, and grace may perhaps be dispensed with and human nature without supernatural assistance be found equal to the conflict with sin.

¹ See on the whole subject Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, Introd. p. xvi. seq., and Schaff's *History of the Church*, "Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity," vol. ii. p. 790 seq.

² Bright, p. ix.

There was, however, the fact of universal depravity to be explained. What account could be given of the fact that sin is found everywhere? Pelagius could only explain it by saying that it resulted from *the universal following of Adam's example*. Adam's fall, according to him, had no effect on the nature of his descendants. But by sinning he set an example which all, or almost all (for Pelagius admitted exceptions), had followed. This is the view of original sin which was revived by the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century, and which is condemned in the opening words of our Article. **Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk.** The meaning of the English phrase is made clear by a reference to the Latin, *Peccatum originis non est in imitatione Adami situm*. "Standeth not" is equivalent to "does not consist;"¹ "the following of Adam" is the imitation of him, or sinning after his example.

In support of the assertion of the Article, and the position taken up by the Church on this subject, it appears to be sufficient to appeal to the teaching of S. Paul in Rom. v. 12-15: "As through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned: for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, *even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression*, who is a figure of Him that was to come."

Universal depravity is recognised as a fact throughout the Old Testament, but no explanation of it is offered. There appear to be only two possible ones. Either, as the Pelagians asserted, it results from the fact that all

¹ Compare the similar use of "standeth" in the Second Collect at Mattins: "in knowledge of whom *standeth* our eternal life."

men follow Adam's example, and sin "after the likeness of his transgression," or there is a "fault" in the inherited nature which makes sinning easy and natural. Jewish writings outside the Canon show us that though there was no consistent doctrine among the Jews on the subject, yet some among them were feeling their way towards the position laid down by S. Paul, and were inclined to hold that universal sin was due to the fact that the fall of Adam had permanently affected his descendants.¹ And on this point the teaching of the New Testament is quite clear. The passage cited above is decisive as to the apostle's view, and conclusive against the Pelagian theory, while the whole line of argument in the early chapters of the Epistle to the Romans tends to establish the fact that Adam's sin had a far-reaching effect upon mankind, that through it sin gained an entrance into the world and that all his descendants inherited a tendency to sin.²

¹ See Wisd. ii. 23 *seq.*; Ecclus. xxv. 24 [33]; 4 Ezra iii. 7, 21 *seq.*; Apoc. Baruch xvii. 3, xxiii. 4; and cf. Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 165 *seq.*, and Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 136 *seq.*

² The question may be raised how far is the Church's doctrine on this subject, and S. Paul's teaching in particular, affected by "critical" views of the Old Testament, and the belief that in Gen. i.-iii. we have a symbolical representation of spiritual truths rather than a literal history. On this subject a valuable letter will be found in the *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. p. 329, and reference may also be made to Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 146, where it is pointed out that the narrative in Genesis is "the typical and summary representation of a series of facts which no discovery of flint implements and half calcined bones can ever reproduce for us. In some way or other, as far back as history goes, and we may believe much further, there has been implanted in the human race this mysterious seed of sin, which, like other characteristics of the human race, is capable of transmission. The tendency to sin is present in every man who is born into the world. But the tendency does not become actual sin until it takes effect in defiance of an express command, in deliberate disregard of a known distinction between right and wrong. How men came to be possessed of such a command, by what process they arrived at the conscious distinction of right and wrong, we can

It may be added, that the conclusion which has forced itself upon the minds of theologians as an inference from the statements of Holy Scripture, that there is a taint in the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, is in remarkable accordance with the teaching of secular philosophers and poets,¹ and is but the theological expression of the doctrine which has been not discovered, but formulated by modern science under the name of heredity.

(c) *Original righteousness.* — Having set aside the Pelagian heresy, the Article proceeds with its account of original sin, and lays down that it is **“the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from**

but vaguely speculate. Whatever it was, we may be sure that it could not have been presented to the imagination of primitive peoples otherwise than in such simple forms as the narrative assumes in the Book of Genesis. The really essential truths all come out in that narrative—the recognition of the Divine will, the act of disobedience to the will so recognised, the perpetuation of the tendency to such disobedience, and we may add, perhaps, though here we get into a region of surmises, the connexion between moral evil and physical decay, for the surest pledge of immortality is the relation of the highest part in us, the soul, through righteousness to God. These salient principles, which may have been due in fact to a process of gradual accretion through long periods, are naturally and inevitably summed up as a group of single incidents. Their essential character is not altered, and in the interpretation of primitive beliefs we may safely remember that “a thousand years in the sight of God are but as one day.” . . . It would be absurd to expect the language of modern science in the prophet who first incorporated the traditions of his race in the sacred books of the Hebrews. He uses the only kind of language available to his own intelligence and that of his contemporaries. But if the language which he does use is from that point of view abundantly justified, then the application which S. Paul makes of it is equally justified. He, too, expresses truth through symbols; and in the days when men can dispense with symbols his teaching may be obsolete, but not before.”

¹ See the interesting lecture on this subject in Mozley's *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 148 seq.

original righteousness." What, then, was this "original righteousness" from which man is "very far gone"? Following out the indications on the subject that may be gathered from Scripture, ancient writers have generally described it as being partly natural, partly supernatural,—natural in that it proceeded from free will and the power of choice, supernatural in that certain special gifts and graces in addition to free will were required for its exercise.¹ Adam could not have had concupiscence or lust, *i.e.* the direct inclination to evil which is now the incentive to sin in our nature, for he was made "in the image of God," and was "very good." On the other hand, as he was in a state of trial, there must have been something in him which sin could take hold of—a starting-point for temptation. To protect him from yielding, it is thought that he must have "had by his created disposition a pleasure in goodness, and that pleasure naturally preserved him in obedience without the need of express effort."² This natural pleasure in goodness, which is practically equivalent to an *implanted virtuous character*, is what has been called

¹ See the quotations in Bishop Bull's famous discourse "On the State of Man before the Fall" (*Works*, ii. p. 52 *seq.*). Bull concludes that "the meaning of the question [whether the original righteousness of the first man was supernatural], if it signify anything to any considerable purpose, is clearly this, whether Adam in the state of integrity needed a supernatural principle or power in order to the performing of such a righteousness as through the gracious acceptance of God should have been available to an eternal and celestial life and happiness. And the question being thus stated, ought to be held in the affirmative, if the consentient determination of the Church of God may be allowed its due weight in the balance of our judgments." "There is a sense, indeed," he adds, "wherein we may safely acknowledge the original righteousness or the first man to have been natural, and it is this, that he received the principle of that righteousness *a natiuitate sua*, from his nativity, in his very creation, and together with his nature" (*Op. cit.* p. 131). Reference should also be made to S. Thomas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1^{ma}, Q. xciv. *seq.*

² Mozley, *The Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 91.

by divines the *donum supernaturale*. It may be best understood by regarding it as a supernatural bias towards good, so that the natural tendency of man was to do what was right in consequence of this Divinely ordered inclination of his will in that direction. "This implanted rectitude," it may be added, "or good habit it was which made the first sin of man so heinous, and caused that distinction between it and all the other sins which have been committed in the world. For the first sin was the only sin which was committed against and in spite of a settled bias of nature towards good; all the other sins which have been committed since have been committed in accordance with a natural bias towards evil. There was therefore a perversity in the first sin altogether peculiar to it, and such as made it a *sin sui generis*." ¹

In view of modern theories of development, it may be added that there is nothing whatever in Holy Scripture to make us think that man was in his unfallen condition *perfect*. Innocent he is distinctly represented as being. His state is one of primitive simplicity. But this is all. Nor is there anything in the Biblical account to lead us to imagine that he was in a high state of civilisation or of intellectual greatness. Scripture gives no countenance to the view that "an Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam"; and more than one of the early Fathers denies that Adam was created "perfect" (τέλειος).²

¹ Mozley, *The Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 91.

² Thus Theophilus of Antioch (180) says that God placed Adam in Paradise διδούς αὐτῷ ἀφορμὴν προκοπῆς ὅπως αὐξάνων καὶ τέλειος γενόμενος, κ.τ.λ., *Ad Autolyc.* ii. 24; while Clement of Alexandria directly raises the question whether Adam was formed perfect or incomplete (τέλειος ἢ ἀτελής), and answers that he "was not made perfect in respect to his constitution, but in a fit condition to receive virtue" (*Stromata*, VI. xii. 96), "where," as Bishop Bull says, "he plainly enough teacheth that

(d) *The effect of the Fall.*—If the condition of man in his primitive condition before he had actually sinned was as it has been described above, what, it will be asked, was the effect of the Fall? Concerning this there have been various views held, differing in regard to the extent of the depravity actually inherited by all men.

(i.) The Greek Fathers generally, and the earlier Latin ones as well, laid no great stress on the Fall, and the most that can be said is that—so far as they have any definite teaching on the subject at all—they hold that it involved the loss of the supernatural bias of the will towards good, but nothing more. Man was left with a fundamentally sound nature, with no direct bias in one direction or the other. Thus on this view “original sin” is nothing more than a loss of higher goodness; a state of defect rather than of positive sin; a *privatio* rather than a *depravatio naturæ*.

(ii.) Augustine and his followers in the controversy with the Pelagians dealt fully with the subject, and drew out more thoroughly than had yet been done the teaching of Scripture, showing therefrom that the Fall involved something more than only the withdrawal of the supernatural gifts, and left man with a corrupt nature, a *direct bias towards evil*. “The will,” says Mozley, “according to the earlier school was not substantially affected by the Fall. . . . But in Augustine’s scheme the will itself was disabled at the Fall; and not only certain impulses to it withdrawn, its power of

Adam was from the beginning not indeed made perfect, but yet endowed with the capacity whereby he might arrive to perfect virtue.” See the whole passage (*Works*, ii. p. 72), and cf. *Lux Mundi*, p. 535: “All that we are led to believe is that the historical development of man has not been the development simply as God meant it. It has been tainted throughout its whole fabric by an element of moral disorder, of human wilfulness.”

choice was gone, and man was unable not only to rise above a defective goodness, but to avoid positive sin. He was thenceforth, prior to the operation of grace, in a state of necessity on the side of evil, a slave to the devil and to his own inordinate lusts."¹

(iii.) In later days, many of the schoolmen, and after them the Roman divines of the sixteenth century, were content to regard original sin in a somewhat milder light than this, and to view it rather as a "privatio" than as a state of positive defect. Aquinas, however, after speaking of it as "quædam privatio," "carentia originalis justitiæ," terms it "inordinata dispositio, languor naturæ," and freely admits that it is more than a mere "privatio."² But the Council of Trent, following Scotus, regards it mainly as "the loss of holiness and righteousness";³ and Bellarmine distinctly teaches that it is only the result of the withdrawal of the supernatural gift.⁴

(iv.) On the other hand, both Lutherans and Calvinists have generally maintained an *entire* depravation of human nature, so that man is only inclined to evil; and they have sometimes used such strong and exaggerated language on the corruption of man's nature, as to suggest that since the Fall the image of God is wholly

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 125. For Augustine's teaching reference may be made to the *Enchiridion*, § 10; *De Natura et gratia*, c. iii.; and the treatise *De Gratia Christi et de Peccato originali*.

² "Habet privationem originalis justitiæ et cum hoc inordinatam dispositionem partium animæ, unde non est privatio pura sed et quædam habitus corruptus," *Summa*, 1^{ma} 2^æ Q. lxxxii, l. 441.

³ Decree concerning original sin, Session V. (June 17, 1546).

⁴ "Corruptio naturæ non ex alicujus doni carentia, neque ex alicujus malæ qualitatis accessu, sed ex sola doni supernaturalis ob Adæ peccatum amissione profluxit," *De gratia primi hominis*, c. v.; cf. c. i.; and *Amis. gratiæ*, iii. 1. Modern Roman teaching is on just the same lines. See Moehler's *Symbolism*, p. 43 seq.; and Perrone, *Prælectiones*, vol. iii. p. 122 seq.

obliterated, and the nature of man no better than that of the evil spirits. Thus the "Westminster Confession" says of our first parents: "By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."¹

To which of these views thus briefly enumerated, it may be fairly asked, does the Anglican Article incline? It clearly takes a darker view than that of the Greek Fathers, and of the Roman Church as represented by the Council of Trent. Original sin is more than a "privatio." It is a "depravatio naturæ." It **"deserves God's wrath and damnation."** Such language can only be used of something positive, not simply of a withdrawal of supernatural grace. But, on the other hand, strong as the language of the Article is, it falls very far short of that of the "Westminster Confession," and of Calvinists in general. "Quam longissime" in the Latin Article, if pressed, might perhaps be taken to indicate agreement with the Calvinist notion of a *total* loss of original

¹ West. Conf. c. vi. So the *Formula Concordiæ* (1577) says that original sin "is so deep a corruption of human nature, that nothing healthy or incorrupt in a man's soul or body, in inner or outward powers," is left. Similar but even stronger language is used in the *Confessio Helvetica* II. c. 8: "Peccatum autem intelligimus esse nativam illam hominis corruptionem ex primis illis nostris parentibus in nos omnes derivatam vel propagatam, qua concupiscentiis pravis immersi et a bono aversi, ad omne vero malum propensi, pleni omni nequitia, diffidentia, contentu et odio Dei, nihil boni ex nobis ipsis facere, imo ne cogitare quidem possumus."

righteousness; but if so, the English "*very far gone*" would appear strangely inadequate. Moreover, there is a significant silence about any imputation of Adam's sin (a prominent feature in later Calvinistic teaching); and that the Article is seriously defective from a Calvinistic point of view, is conclusively shown by the suggested emendations of the Assembly of Divines in 1643. They were not satisfied with it as it stood, but wished to insert a reference to the imputation of Adam's sin, and to materially strengthen the language of the Article, substituting "wholly deprived of" for "very far gone from," and insisting that man "is of his own nature *only* inclined to evil."¹

This being so, we need have no hesitation in interpreting the Latin by the English, and may rest content with the statement that man is "*very far gone from original righteousness*." So much is clearly taught in Holy Scripture. Not to lay too much stress on the language of the Psalmist, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. li. 5), or on the question of Job, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" (Job xiv. 4), we notice that all through Scripture man is regarded as by nature corrupt. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. viii. 21); "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually" (vi. 5); "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately sick" (Jer. xvii. 9). So also in the New Testament: "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18). "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be; and they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 7). But, on the

¹ See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 559, where the Article is given as amended by the Divines.

other hand, there are passages which no less clearly indicate that, in spite of this universal depravity, the "image of God," in which man was originally created, still remains since the Fall, and therefore it cannot be true to say that he is "wholly deprived of" his original righteousness. Thus in Gen. ix. 6 the law, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," is based on the fact that "in the image of God made He man." In 1 Cor. xi. 7, S. Paul speaks of man as "the image and glory of God," while S. James says that men are "made after the likeness of God" (iii. 9).

It may then be fairly concluded that on this subject the Church of England is *in the main* content to follow the teaching of Augustine: only, however, in the main, for there are statements which Augustine was led to make in the course of the controversy with the Pelagians to which we are most certainly not called upon to subscribe. To mention one point only. Augustine asserted that *as a fact* infants and others dying unbaptized meet with the punishment of hell.¹ Article IX. is careful only to state that original sin "*deserves* God's wrath and damnation,"—a statement which follows naturally from the view taken of it as something positive, involving a real taint and disorder of the nature, but which falls short of expressing any opinion on the further question whether it actually meets with that which it deserves.²

¹ *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, I. xxi., II. c. iv.; cf. Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. xiv, note 4.

² See on this point a striking letter of the late Dean Church, *Life and Letters*, p. 248. "The fact of what is meant by original sin is as mysterious and inexplicable as the origin of evil, but it is obviously as much a fact. There is a fault and vice in the *race*, which, given time, as surely develops into actual sin as our physical constitution, given at birth, does into sickness and physical death. It is of this inherited sin in our nature, looked upon in the abstract and without reference to concrete cases, that I suppose the Article speaks. How can we suppose that such a nature looks in God's eyes according to the standard of perfect right-

As an illustration of this, reference may be made to the careful reticence of the note at the end of the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer. "It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." Nothing whatever is said of what happens in the case of those who die unbaptized, and the reticence is evidently designed; for the note in question was copied almost verbatim from the "Institution of a Christian Man" (1537), which proceeded to say "*and else not.*"¹ The

eousness which we also suppose to be God's standard and law. Does it satisfy that standard? Can He look with neutrality on its divergence from His perfect standard? What is His moral judgment of it as a subject for moral judgment? What He may do to cure it, to pardon it, to make allowances for it in known or unknown ways, is another matter, about which His known attributes of mercy alone may reassure us; but the question is, How does He look upon this fact of our nature *in itself*, that without exception it has this strong efficacious germ of evil within it, of which He sees all the possibilities and all the consequences? Can He look on it, even in germ, with complacency or indifference? Must He not judge it and condemn it as *in itself*, because evil, deserving condemnation? I cannot see what other answer can be given but one, and this is what the Article says. But all this settles nothing about the actual case of unbaptized infants, any more than the general necessity of believing the gospel settles anything as to the actual case of heathens who have never heard of the gospel. If, without fear, we leave them to the merciful dispensations, unrevealed to us, of Him who is their Father, though they do not know Him, much more may we leave infants who have never exercised will or reason. But in both cases we are obliged by facts and Scripture to acknowledge sinfulness and sin. In Christians, and those who may know of the gospel, this is cured, relieved, taken away, by known means which He has given us. In those who, by no fault of their own, are out of His family and Church, we cannot doubt, both from what we know of Him and from what He has told us, that He will provide what is necessary. But still *there* is the sinfulness and the sin; and as sin, *quâ* sin, we can only suppose that He looks on it with displeasure, and condemns it. I don't see that the Article, which is only treating of sin and sinfulness, and not of its remedy or God's love, does more than express what must be God's judgment on all sin, even in germ. How He deals with it is a separate matter."

¹ *Formularies of Faith*, p. 93.

omission of these three words is highly significant; and it may be added that, though the work possesses no authority, yet the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* may be appealed to as an historical witness that by the time of the reign of Edward VI. leading Anglican divines had come to see that while salvation must be denied to those who despise or reject baptism, yet in the case of children (at least of Christian parents) dying unbaptized through no fault of their own, there is room for good hope.¹

II. *The effect of Baptism in the removal of Original Sin.*

In considering the effect of holy baptism in the removal of original sin, it must be remembered that there are *two* evils attaching to all sin, viz. the *guilt*, which needs pardon and forgiveness, and the *power*, which needs overcoming and driving out. On the view taken by the English Church, that what we call "original sin" is something more than a loss of higher goodness, being a germ of real evil, this is true of it as of all other sin. It has its guilt, which makes us "children of wrath";²

¹ *De Hæresibus*, c. 18: "Illorum etiam impia videri debet scrupulosa superstitio, qui Dei gratiam et Spiritum Sanctum tantopere cum sacramentorum elementis colligant, ut plane affirmant nullum Christianorum infantem æternam salutem esse consecuturum, qui prius a morte fuerit occupatus, quam ad baptismum adduci potuerit: quod longe secus habere judicamus. Salus enim illis solum adimitur, qui sacrum hunc baptismi fontem contemnunt, aut superbia quadam ab eo, vel contumacia resiliunt; quæ importunitas cum in puerorum ætatem non cadat, nihil contra salutem illorum autoritate Scripturarum decerni potest, immo contra cum illos communis promissio pueros in se comprehendat, optima nobis spes de illorum salute concipienda est." See also Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, Bk. V. c. lx. § 6.

² Compare the description in the Church Catechism of the "inward and spiritual grace" in baptism. "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for *being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath*, we are hereby made the children of grace." The expression "children of wrath" is Biblical, and comes from Eph. ii. 3, τέκνα ὀργῆς.

and it has its power, which, in the form of concupiscence, draws us in the direction of evil. In baptism the guilt is pardoned. **There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized** (“*Renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio*”),¹ a statement for which ample support may be found in Holy Scripture (see Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16, etc.), and which will be further illustrated under Article XXVII.² But the *power* of sin, that appetite for corrupt pleasure which is the incentive to sin in us still remains.³ **This infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate** (etiam in renatis), **whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρόνημα σαρκός, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh is not subject to the law of God.** This is unhappily a truth of universal experience, for which scriptural proof is scarcely needed. All history and the facts of each man’s own experience combine in testifying to the existence of the old nature even after baptism and the reception of Divine grace. The phrase φρόνημα σαρκός, and the account given in the Article of this “lust of the flesh,” is based on Rom. viii. 6, 7: “For the mind of the flesh⁴ (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός) is death;

¹ It should be noticed (1) that *renatis* in the Latin of the Article corresponds to “are baptized” in the English, thus marking the close connection between regeneration and baptism; and (2) that there is nothing in the English corresponding to *propter Christum* in the Latin.

² The statement of the Article may be further illustrated from the Baptismal Offices in the Book of Common Prayer, in which remission of sins is throughout regarded as one of the blessings granted in baptism to infants as well as to those of riper years.

³ Compare Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, Lib. II. c. iv.: “Concupiscentia . . . cum parvulis nascitur, in parvulis baptizatis a reati solvitur, ad agonem relinquitur.”

⁴ The Vulgate translates this phrase by *prudentia* in ver. 6, and *sapientia carnis* in ver. 7. The Geneva Version has “wisdom of the

but the mind of the spirit is life and peace: because *the mind of the flesh* is enmity against God; for it *is not subject to the law of God*, neither indeed can it be."

III. *The Character of Concupiscence.*

There remains the question, What is the character of this concupiscence which, as all agree, remains even in the regenerate? Is it, before it positively breaks out into definite acts of sin, to be regarded as itself "true and proper sin," or is it merely to be reckoned as "an incentive to sin, arising from sin and inclining to it"? The question was keenly debated in the sixteenth century, the Church of Rome and the followers of Calvin returning diametrically opposite answers to it. The Roman view of concupiscence is given in the decrees of the Council of Trent, at the fifth session of which the subject was discussed, A.D. 1546, some years, therefore, before the Anglican Article was drawn up. The Tridentine divines in this decree maintain the following positions:—

(i.) In baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, and "all that has the true and proper nature of sin" is taken away (*totum id quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet*).

(ii.) There remains concupiscence, or an incentive to sin, which is left for us to strive against, but cannot injure those who consent not.

(iii.) "This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin, the holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in the regenerate, but because it

flesh"; but in the Bishops' Bible there is the following note: "*φρονούσι* and *φρόνημα*, Greek words, do not so much signify wisdom and prudence, as affection, carefulness, and minding of anything."

is of sin and inclines to sin" (quia ex peccato est et ad peccatum inclinatur).¹

This position is quite clear and definite. Concupiscence, though it often leads to sin, is not "true and proper sin." Equally definite is the statement of Calvinists on the other side. According to them, concupiscence *is* "true and proper sin." So the Gallican Confession of 1561-6 asserts: "We affirm that this fault is truly sin even after baptism";² and in accordance with this, when, in 1543, the "Assembly of Divines" attempted to revise the Thirty-nine Articles in the interests of Calvinism, they proposed to substitute "is truly and properly sin"³ for the milder statement of our own Article, which, it must be confessed, is somewhat ambiguous, and wanting in the precision of both the Roman and the Calvinistic statements.

The apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin (rationem peccati). It is hard to say exactly what this means. The Tridentine phrase "ratio peccati" is used, but there is nothing about "true and proper nature"; and the Article leaves us uncertain whether it is intended that we should regard concupiscence as truly sin or not. The ambiguity is in all probability designed;⁴ nor need we regret that we are not called upon to give a more precise account of concupiscence. It is sufficient for us that it is very closely connected with sin, and that, if unchecked, it issues in sin. This is the practical matter,

¹ Canons of the Council of Trent, Session V. Decree on Original Sin.

² Niemayer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 332; cf. Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 109.

³ Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 560.

⁴ The Thirteen Articles drawn up in 1538 had, like the Confession of Augsburg, asserted that concupiscence is "vere peccatum." This makes the form of expression employed in our own Article still more noticeable,

and there, with wise moderation, those who drew up this Article were content to leave it.

One other question remains, to which it is not altogether easy to return a clear answer. The Article refers to "the Apostle" as saying that concupiscence "hath of itself the nature of sin." To what passage or passages is allusion here made? S. Paul, who is evidently meant by "the Apostle," nowhere directly terms concupiscence sin (although the Council of Trent maintains that he *does*), nor does any phrase corresponding to "*ratio peccati*" occur anywhere in Holy Scripture. On the whole, it appears probable that the passages in the mind of those who penned the Article were such as these, Rom. vi. 12, vii. 8; Gal. v. 16-24, in all of which lust or concupiscence is spoken of as closely connected with sin. Reference may also be made to the teaching of S. James on the same subject: "Each man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin; and sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death" (i. 14, 15).

ARTICLE X

De Libero Arbitrio.

Ea est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare non possit: Quare absque gratia Dei, quæ per Christum est, nos præveniente, ut velimus, et co-operante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quæ Deo grata sint et accepta, nihil valemus.

Of Freewill.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

THE original Article of 1553 consisted only of the latter part of our present Article, beginning with the words, "We have no power," etc.¹ Its language was evidently suggested by a passage in Augustine's work, *On Grace and Freewill*, in which he says that "we have no power to do good works without God working that we may have a good will, and co-operating when we have that good will."²

The clause which now stands first in the Article was prefixed in 1563 by Archbishop Parker, being taken by him from the Confession of Württemberg.³ The object of

¹ "Working *with us*" was substituted for "working *in us*" as a translation of "co-operante" in 1571.

² *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, xvii.: "Sine illo vel operante ut velimus vel co-operante cum volumus, ad bonæ pietatis opera nihil valemus."

³ "Quod autem nonnulli affirmant homini post lapsum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis

the Article of 1553 is to disavow all sympathy with the Anabaptist denial of the absolute need of grace. This is indicated by a passage in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which, after a condemnation of the revival of the Pelagian heresy of these fanatics, we read: "Et similiter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo solo sine alia speciali Christi gratia recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituent."¹ But the clause added by Parker from the Confession of Würtemberg seems also designed to condemn the theory of "congruous merit," which will be considered under Article XIII. There are two subjects which call for some consideration in connection with this Article—

1. Freewill.
2. The need of Grace.

I. *Freewill.*

It will be noticed that, although the title is **Of Freewill**, yet it is scarcely warranted by the substance of the Article that follows, in which freewill in the abstract is neither asserted nor denied. The title, then, of this Article, as of some others, is not quite accurate, and a more exact one would be "of the need of grace."² What is denied in the Article is the *power* and ability to turn to God and do good works without the assistance of God Himself: what is asserted is the absolute need of grace preventing and co-operating: but of "Freewill" in itself nothing whatever is directly said.

The statement of the first part of the Article follows

operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac preparare, haud obscure pugnat cum apostolica doctrina et cum vero ecclesiæ Catholicæ consensu."—*De Peccato*. See Hardwick, p. 125.

¹ *De Hæres.* c. vii.

² Cf. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 152.

naturally and directly from the view of "original sin" maintained in Article IX. It was there shown that the Church of England regards original sin as no mere "privatio" or loss of higher goodness only; but rather as a "depravatio naturæ," a real corruption of our nature, "whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil." If this is true, it follows as a necessary consequence that **the condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God.**

The position, then, taken up in the Article is that, though the will may be left free by God, yet there is in unaided man a lack of *power*. This is the teaching of the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man" (1543), with which the Article is in substantial agreement.

"Though there remain a certain freedom of the will in those things that do pertain to the desires and works of this present life, yet to perform spiritual and heavenly things, freewill is of itself insufficient; and therefore the power of man's freewill, being thus wounded and decayed, hath need of a physician to heal it, and an help to repair it."¹

II. *The need of Grace.*

While the Article thus neither affirms nor denies the freedom of the will in the abstract, its teaching on the absolute necessity of Divine grace for the performance of works that are "grata Deo" is clear and decisive.

¹ See *Formularies of Faith*, p. 360. Cf. also the Tridentine statement on the subject (Sess. VI. c. i.): "Freewill, attenuated and bent down as it was in its powers, was by no means extinguished."

We have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

It is especially needful to remember, in studying this Article and those which immediately follow (XI.—XIII.), that they are concerned with God's method of dealing with those who are brought into covenant with Him through Christianity, and that what is said in them has little or no bearing on the case of those who live and die without ever having heard the gospel of Christ. Their case is not contemplated. Such terms as "faith and calling upon God," "good works, pleasant and acceptable to God," "grace of God by Christ preventing us . . . and working with us," etc., are expressions which properly refer to Christians; and therefore nothing that is said in these Articles need necessarily raise questions as to the "good works" of the heathen, and the light in which they are regarded by God. All that need be said is that they are not what the Articles call "good works, pleasant and acceptable to God" (*Deo grata et accepta*). This phrase, which we meet with here for the first time, is almost a technical one, used for the works of Christians done in a Christian spirit and from Christian motives. Thus it is used in Article XII. of those good works which "are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification." These are said to be "*grata Deo et accepta in Christo*"; whereas, according to Article XIII., "works done before the grace of Christ and inspiration of His Spirit" are "*minime Deo grata*." More will be said on this subject when these Articles are reached. But so much it seemed necessary to say at the outset in connection with the first occurrence of the phrase. To return now to the teaching of the Article before us: It

states that twofold grace is needed—(1) *preventing grace* (*gratia præveniens*), inclining the will to choose the good;¹ and (2) *co-operating grace* (*gratia co-operans*), assisting man to act, when the will has already been inclined to choose the good. The technical phrase “*gratia præveniens*” is apparently due to Augustine, who makes use of it several times,² and it seems to have been suggested to him by the Latin of Ps. lix. (lviii.) 10: “*Deus meus misericordia ejus præveniet me*,” a text which he quotes frequently. The term “*gratia co-operans*” is also his,³ and, like “*preventing grace*,” is based on Scripture. See Phil. ii. 13: “For it is God that *worketh* (*qui operatur*) *in us* both to will and to do of His good pleasure”; and compare [S. Mark] xvi. 20: “The Lord also *working with them*” (*Domino co-operante*). On the necessity of both kinds of grace, the teaching of Scripture, which is faithfully reflected in the Book of Common Prayer,⁴ as well as the Articles, is clear and definite. The beginning, the middle, and end of man’s salvation is influenced by God.

For the need of preventing grace, besides the passage just cited from Phil. ii. 13, it is sufficient to refer to our Lord’s own words in S. John vi. 44: “No man can come to Me, except the Father which sent Me, draw him,”

¹ For scholastic teaching on grace and the divisions into *gratia operans* and *co-operans*, as well as into *gratia præveniens* and *subsequens*, see Aquinas, *Summa* 1^{ma} 2^æ Q. cxi.

² *Serm.* 176, § 5; *De Nat. et Gratia*, § 35; *Contra duas Epist.* II. § 21. Cf. Bright’s *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. xix.

³ *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, c. xvii.

⁴ See the Collect for Easter Day: “Almighty God . . . we humbly beseech Thee, that, as *by Thy special grace preventing us* Thou dost put into our minds good desires, so *by Thy continual help* we may bring the same to good effect.” The Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity: “Lord, we pray Thee that Thy grace may always *prevent and follow us*, and make us continually to be given to all good works”; and the fourth Collect at the end of the Order of Holy Communion: “*Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with Thy most gracious favour and further us with Thy continual help.*”

and to such a phrase as that used in Acts xvi. 14, where the Lord is said to have "opened the heart" of Lydia, "to give heed unto the things which were spoken by God." While for co-operating grace reference may be made to S. Paul's attribution of all that he did, not to himself, but to "the grace of God which was with" him (1 Cor. xv. 10; cf. Gal. ii. 20); and to our Lord's teaching in S. John xv. 4, 5: "Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit; for apart from Me ye can do nothing."

But while we thus, on the one hand, in dependence on the teaching of Scripture, assert the absolute need of grace, and trace everything good in man to the action of Him from whom alone cometh "every good gift, and every perfect boon" (S. James i. 17); yet, on the other hand, it is equally necessary to insist, still in fullest harmony with the teaching of Scripture,—which everywhere assumes man's responsibility and power of responding to God's claim,—upon the freewill of man; for so only can any sense of human responsibility be developed.¹ We cannot, indeed, reconcile and harmonise the two counter-truths of freewill and the need of grace; but we can hold them both,² and place them side by side, as S. Paul himself does in the passage already quoted. "Work out your own salvation with fear and

¹ "There can be no question that S. Paul fully recognises the freedom of the human will. The large part which exhortation plays in his letters is conclusive proof of this."—Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 216.

² Cf. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, II. c. xviii.: "[Nature] forbids us so to maintain God's grace as to seem to take away freewill; and, on the other hand, so to assert its liberty as to lay ourselves open to the censure of being ungrateful to the grace of God in the arrogance of our impiety."

trembling" (there is man's freedom, for it is idle to tell him to "work" unless he is free to work or not to work), "for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (there is the need of grace, both preventing and co-operating).

The teaching of S. Paul in Rom. vii. shows more clearly perhaps than any other passage, the state of the case as regards the freedom of the will, and makes it apparent that, though left free by God, the will of man has since the Fall been warped in the direction of evil, and thus man finds himself, as it were, under two different and incompatible laws. On the one hand, he approves of the law of God, and acknowledges himself bound to obey it. On the other, he feels that he is under the dominion of another law which continually leads him to sin. "To will (τὸ θέλειν)¹ is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would (ὃ θέλω) I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good (τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν), evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members" (vers. 18-23). This double state or condition in which man finds himself is recognised by heathen poets and moralists.² It has in its favour the testimony of facts,

¹ It must be noticed that S. Paul does not use the word βούλομαι, which "lays the greater stress on the idea of purpose and deliberation," but only θέλειν, the more emotional word. See Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*

² The lines of Ovid are well known—

"Video meliora proboque,
Deteriora sequor."

So Seneca asks: "What is it which, while we are going one way, drags

and our natural instincts which lead us while recognising our freedom and moral responsibility to refer everything that is good in us to God. But Scripture alone throws any light on its origin. Man's greatness is fallen greatness. This is the only explanation of the perpetual contrast between man's aspirations and man's achievements, the greatness and nobility of the one, and the lamentable failure of the other. The doctrine of the Fall is the key to the riddle of human nature.¹

It only remains to point out how this Tenth Article avoids opposite errors in connection with the difficult subject of Grace and Freewill.

(a) By its guarded reference to Freewill, which it neither asserts nor denies, it escapes the error into which Luther fell, of using such extreme language on the slavery of the will as practically to amount to a denial of human responsibility.²

(b) By its direct assertion of the absolute need of grace preventing and co-operating, it avoids the Pelagian heresy revived by the Anabaptists, which denied the necessity of grace and supernatural assistance.

(c) The terms in which the need of grace is spoken of are so worded as to avoid altogether the unscriptural views of the Anabaptists, and the exaggerations of the Calvinists, who maintained a theory of "irresistible

us another, and impels us thither, from whence we are longing to recede? What is it that struggles with our soul and never permits us to do anything? We vacillate between two opinions: We will nothing freely, nothing perfectly, nothing always."—*Ep.* lii.

¹ Cf. Pascal, *Pensées*, arts. xviii.—xxii.

² See the language from his treatise *De Servo Arbitrio*, quoted in Bishop Browne *On the Articles*, p. 259: "In his actings towards God, in things pertaining to salvation or damnation, man has no freewill, but is the captive, the subject, and the servant, either of the will of God or of Satan." "If we believe that God foreknows and predestinates everything . . . then it follows that there can be no such thing as freewill in man or angel or any other creature."

grace.”¹ Such views were still more effectually excluded by the Tenth Article of 1553, which was headed “Of Grace,” and followed the one before us.

De Gratia.

Gratia Christi, seu Spiritus Sanctus qui per eundem datur, cor lapideum aufert, et dat cor carneum. Atque licet ex nolentibus quæ recta sunt volentes faciat, et ex volentibus prava, nolentes reddat, voluntati nihilominus violentiam nullam infert. Et nemo hac de causa cum peccaverit, seipsum excusare potest, quasi nolens aut coactus peccaverit, ut eam ob causam accusari non mereatur aut damnari.

Of Grace.

The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by Him given doth take away the stony heart, and giveth an heart of flesh. And although, those that have no will to good things, He maketh them to will, and those that would evil things, He maketh them not to will the same: yet nevertheless He enforceth not the will. And therefore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself, as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillingly or by compulsion.

This was certainly primarily aimed at some among the Anabaptists who “seem to have been pushing their belief in absolute predestination to such frightful lengths that human actions were esteemed involuntary, and the *evil* choice of man ascribed to a necessitating fiat of his Maker.”² Its omission by Archbishop Parker in the revision of 1563 is probably due to the less formidable character of the danger of Anabaptism at that time. But it is possible that Parker was influenced by the fact that the Article was likely to be displeasing to some of the Marian exiles, who had returned to England with strong predilections in favour of Calvinism, and whom it

¹ This is closely connected with Calvin’s teaching on Predestination, which will be considered below under Article XVII.

² Hardwick, p. 99. Cf. the letter of Bishop Hooper (quoted in vol. i. p. 22), where it is said of the Anabaptists that “they maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and beside that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will, by which He altogether acts under some kind of necessity.”

was desired to retain in the Church. The excision of the Article would remove a stumbling-block from their path, as there is nothing in our present Article to which they could take exception, though from their point of view they might consider that its statements required supplementing.

ARTICLE XI

De Hominis Justificatione.

Tantum propter meritum Domini ac servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur: quare sola fide nos justificari, doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima: ut in Homilia de justificatione hominis fusius explicatur.

Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

IN its present form this Article dates from the Elizabethan revision in 1563. The Edwardian Article on the same subject was much less explicit: "Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ in that sense, as it is declared in the Homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men."

The Article, as finally drawn up by Parker, is indebted for some of its phrases to the Confessions of Augsburg and Würtemberg. In the latter of these documents we find these words: "*Homo enim fit Deo acceptus, et reputatur coram eo justus propter solum Filium Dei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, per fidem*";¹ while in the former we read as follows: "*Item docent quod homines non possunt justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum, per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus*

¹ *De Justificatione.* See Hardwick, p. 125.

pro justitia coram ipso, Rom. iii. et iv.”¹ And again : “ Ut hanc fidem consequamur, institutum est ministerium docendi Evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta. Nam per verbum et sacramenta, tanquam per instrumenta, donatur Spiritus Sanctus, qui fidem efficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo, in iis qui audiunt evangelium, scilicet, quod Deus *non propter nostra merita, sed propter Christum* justificet hos, qui credunt se propter Christum in gratiam recipi.”² The expressions placed in italics in these extracts will show how far the Article is indebted to Lutheran sources. But while it is undeniable that Parker did to some extent borrow from these documents, yet it is significant that he stopped short, and did not transfer to the Anglican formulary what has been aptly termed “the peculiar symbol of Lutheranism,”³ viz. the statement that a man is justified when he believes himself to be justified,—an expression which occurs in these or almost identical words no fewer than seven times in the Confession of Augsburg.

The object of the Article is to state the mind of the Church of England on the subject of man’s justification, which was regarded in some quarters as the “*articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*,” and which had unhappily given occasion for some of the worst excesses and extravagances of teaching which marked the course of the Reformation.

The subjects which call for consideration in order to a right understanding of the Article are these—

1. Justification, its meaning and relation to Sanctification.

¹ *Conf. Augustana*, art. iv. *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 124.

² *Ib.* art. v.

³ Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 182. What makes the omission the more remarkable is the fact that the expression is actually contained in the fourth Article “De Justificatione” agreed upon by the Conference of Anglicans and Lutherans in 1538. See Hardwick, p. 263.

2. The meritorious cause of Justification.
3. The instrument or formal cause of Justification.
4. The "Homily of Justification."

I. Justification, its meaning and relation to Sanctification.

The Article treats as convertible terms the expressions "to be accounted righteous" (*justus reputari*) and "to be justified" (*justificari*). **We are accounted righteous . . . by faith . . . Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine.** Both phrases are founded on the language of Holy Scripture. The former is based on Gen. xv. 6: "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness" (LXX. ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Vulg. *Credidit Deo et reputatum est illi ad justitiam*). From this passage the phrase is adopted by S. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, c. iv., and throughout this chapter the Greek λογισθῆναι εἰς δικαιοσύνην is always rendered by the Vulgate "*ad justitiam reputari*" (see ver. 3, 5, 9, 11, 22, 23; and cf. Gal. iii. 6; S. James ii. 23). *Justificari*, "to be justified," is also the invariable Latin equivalent for δικαιῶσθαι,—a verb which (in the active or passive) occurs nearly thirty times in S. Paul's Epistles, although used but rarely elsewhere in the New Testament.

To discover the meaning of justification it is therefore necessary to examine and determine the sense in which δικαιῶν and δικαιῶσθαι are used in Scripture.

(a) In the Old Testament the active voice is used by the LXX. as the translation of the Hebrew הִצְדִּיק in a judicial or "forensic" sense: to "do right to a person," i.e. to do justice to his cause, and so to acquit (see Ex. xxiii. 7; Deut. xxv. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 4; 1 Kings viii. 32; 2 Chr. vi. 23; Ps. lxxxii. (lxxxii.) 3; Is.

v. 23, l. 8, liii. 11; Jer. iii. 11; Ezek. xvi. 51, 52); in other words, its meaning is not to "make a person righteous," but to "make him out righteous," or to "treat him as righteous."¹ But in itself the word indicates nothing as to whether he is or is not righteous. So in the passive, a person is said to be "justified" when he is regarded as righteous, held "not guilty," or acquitted (see Gen. xlv. 16; Job xxxiii. 32; Ps. li. (l.) 5, cxliii. (cxlii.) 2; Is. xliii. 9, 26, xlv. 25).

(b) In the New Testament outside the Epistles of S. Paul the word is not of frequent occurrence, but wherever it is found (eleven times in all²) its meaning is just the same. "Wisdom is *justified* by her works" (S. Matt. xi. 19; cf. S. Luke vii. 35), *i.e.* not "made righteous," but *vindicated, proved* to be righteous. In S. Matt. xii. 37 it is opposed to "condemned," and thus is equivalent to "acquitted." "By thy words thou shalt be *justified*, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." The lawyer, willing to *justify* himself, says: "And who is my neighbour?" where the meaning evidently is to vindicate himself, or make himself out to be righteous (S. Luke x. 29; cf. xvi. 15). The publican "went down to his house *justified* rather than" the Pharisee (S. Luke xviii. 14). These are representative instances, and

¹ This is quite in accordance with the classical use of the word, and with what might be expected from the formation of the word. "How can *δικαιοῦν* possibly signify to *make righteous*? Verbs, indeed, of this ending from adjectives of *physical* meaning may have this use, *e.g.* τυφλοῦν, "to make blind." But when such words are derived from adjectives of *moral* meaning, as ἀξιοῦν, ὁσιοῦν, δικαιοῦν, they do by usage, and must from the nature of things signify to *deem*, to *account*, to *prove*, or to *treat* as worthy, holy, righteous." *The Speaker's Commentary* on 1 Cor. vi. 11, quoted in Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 30.

² S. Matt. xi. 19, xii. 37; S. Luke vii. 29, 35, x. 29, xvi. 15, xviii. 14; Acts xiii. 39; S. James ii. 21, 24, 25. In Rev. xxii. 11, which is sometimes cited for the meaning of *infusing* righteousness, the reading is really δικαιοσύνην ποιῶν.

establish the meaning of the word outside S. Paul's writings. But as the phrase "to be justified by faith" is due to him, it becomes necessary to examine further into his usage of the word. It is employed in his Epistles altogether twenty-five times;¹ and while in some cases it is unambiguous and *must* mean *treat as righteous*, and so (in the case of the guilty) pardon and acquit, in no single instance can the meaning of "*make* righteous" be established for it. This statement is one that can easily be verified, and therefore only a few examples need be cited here. "To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that *justifieth* the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 4, 5). "All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God: being *justified* freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 23, 24). "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing against myself; yet am I not hereby *justified*: but He that judgeth me is the Lord" (1 Cor. iv. 3, 4). In 1 Tim. iii. 16 the word is used of Christ, who was "manifested in the flesh, *justified* in the spirit."

From these examples the meaning of the word may be ascertained without difficulty. It is regularly employed of the sentence or verdict pronounced on a man by God, and does not in itself tell us whether the person over whom the sentence is pronounced is really righteous or not. When a man is justified he is "accounted righteous," or regarded as righteous.

This leads to the inquiry, *when* is a man "justified"?

¹ Rom. ii. 13, iii. 4, 20, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, iv. 2, 5; v. 1, 9, vi. 7, viii. 30, 33; 1 Cor. iv. 4, vi. 11; Gal. ii. 16, 17, iii. 8, 11, 24, v. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Titus iii. 7.

And this raises the whole question of the relation of justification to sanctification.

Sanctifico and *sanctificatio* are in the Vulgate the regular equivalent of *ἀγιάζειν* and *ἀγνίζειν*, and of *ἀγίασμος* and *ἀγιωσύνη*, words which are all directly connected with the idea of *making holy*. Thus sanctification is a gradual work, the being really made holy in ourselves by the working of God's Holy Spirit in us. To "grow in grace" is to be sanctified. The question, then, to be decided is not whether obedience and good works are necessary for salvation, not whether sanctification is required, but at what point in the Christian life is the act of justification to be placed? in other words, the question is whether a man is first made righteous (sanctified) by God, and then declared to be so (justified); or whether God as it were *anticipates* what the man will become, and on his repentance accepts him, and for Christ's sake pronounces him "not guilty," the Divine verdict of acquittal running (as it has been said) *in advance* of the actual practice of righteousness.

In the early Church the question was not raised, as the subject of man's justification never came into controversy. But after the rise of Pelagianism it acquired a fresh importance, and assumed a new prominence, owing to the Pelagian assertion of human merit apart from grace; and in the writings of Augustine, while against Pelagianism the absolute need of grace, and the freeness of God's gift of salvation, is fully vindicated, the notion that *justifico* means to *make* righteous, and that justification is therefore an *infusion* of grace, can clearly be traced.¹ This thought was further developed by the

¹ In *De Spiritu et Litera*, § 45, Augustine admits that *justifico* may mean "reckon just," but practically his whole theory is that of an infusion of the grace of faith by which men are made just." Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 150, where these quotations are given; *De*

schoolmen in the Middle Ages, and justification was defined as not only forgiveness of sins, but also an infusion of grace; and thus it was practically made to include sanctification,¹—a view which was finally endorsed by the Council of Trent. The subject was considered at the sixth session of the Council held in January 1547, and justification was decreed to be “not merely the remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inner man, through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts, whereby man from unjust becomes just, from an enemy a friend, that so he may be an heir according to the hope of eternal life.” It was also stated that (1) the *final* cause of justification is the glory of God and of Christ and eternal life; (2) the *efficient* cause is the merciful God; (3) the *meritorious* cause is the Lord Jesus Christ, Who merited justification for us by His Passion; (4) the *instrumental* cause is the sacrament of baptism, “which is the sacrament of faith, without which justification never befell any man”; (5) the *formal* cause is the righteousness (justitia) of God with which we are endowed by Him.² Further, the

Spiritu et Litera, § 18: “Hæc est justitia Dei quæ in Testamento Veteri velata, in Novo revelatur: quæ ideo justitia Dei dicitur quod *impertiendo eam justos facit*.” *Enarratio*, § 6: “Credenti inquit in eum qui justificat impium, deputatur fides ejus ad justitiam si justificatur impius *ex impio fit justus*.”

¹ See the *Summa* of Aquinas, 1^{ma} 2^æ Q. cxiii. 2.

² “Justificatio . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum. Unde homo ex injusto fit justus, et ex inimico amicus, ut sit hæres secundum spem vitæ æternæ. Hujus justificationis causæ sunt, finalis quidem, gloria Dei et Christi, ac vita æterna: efficiens vero misericordia Deus, . . . meritoria autem dilectissimus unigenitus suus, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui cum essemus inimici propter nimiam charitatem, qua dilexit nos, sua sanctissima passione in ligno crucis nobis justificationem meruit, et pro nobis Deo satisfecit: instrumentalis item, sacramentum Baptismi, quod est sacramentum fidei, sine qua ulli nunquam contigit justificatio: demum unica formalis causa est justitia

eleventh Canon passed at the same session anathematizes "any who shall say that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the righteousness of Christ or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost and is inherent in them."¹

Thus according to the Roman view justification includes sanctification. On the other hand, as is well known, Luther and the Reformers generally insisted very strongly and even vehemently on the distinction between justification and sanctification, and on the *forensic* meaning to be given to the former. According to them, justification is the *initial* blessing, when God receives the repentant sinner, pardons, and accepts him. And on this point an examination of S. Paul's usage of the word makes it clear that they were right. The Apostle certainly does distinguish between justification and sanctification, and uses the former word, not for final salvation, nor for infused holiness, but, as the Reformers insisted, for the *initial* blessing, when God accepts a man and, pardoning him, or "not imputing his sins to him," at the outset, treats him as "not guilty." "All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 23, 24; cf. iv. 5, where God is said to justify τὸν ἀσεβῆ). To be justified, according to him, is to be pardoned and accepted; to be taken into

Dei, non qua Ipse justus est, sed qua nos justos facit, qua videlicet ab eo donati, renovamur Spiritu mentis nostræ, et non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur, et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes."—*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. c. vii.

¹ "Si quis dixerit homines justificari, vel sola imputatione justitiæ Christi, vel sola peccatorum remissione, exclusa gratia et charitate, quæ in cordibus eorum per Spiritum Sanctum diffundatur, atque illis inhæreat; aut etiam gratiam qua justificamur esse tantum favorem Dei; anathema sit."—*Ib.* canon xi.

God's favour all sinful and unworthy as we are: and justification, according to this view, contains these two ideas, (1) pardon for sin, and (2) a right and title to eternal life founded upon promise; but the idea of an infused righteousness is not contained in the term. "Being made free from sin"—there is justification—"ye have your fruit unto holiness"—there is sanctification, distinct from justification, but not independent of it.

On the whole, then, it may be safely said that if we are to follow the teaching and language of S. Paul we must at least in thought distinguish between these two blessings, the one (justification) the work of the Son of God *for* us, the other (sanctification) the work of the Holy Spirit *within* us; and so distinguishing them, must hold that in the order of the Christian life justification *precedes* sanctification. In the words of S. Chrysostom, God "crowns us at the outset, making the contest light to us."¹ And if it be said that this introduces into God's dealings with us an element of unreality, man being regarded as righteous when he is not really so, and Christ's merits being "imputed" to him by a sort of legal fiction, it may be replied that there is no more unreality or fiction *necessarily* involved than is implied in all pardon, since the forgiveness of any wrong implies the treating of the doer of it as "not guilty."² But

¹ *Hom. in Rom. xiii.*

² "There is something sufficiently startling in this. The Christian life is made to have its beginning in a fiction. No wonder that the fact is questioned, and that another sense is given to the words—that *δικαιοῦσθαι* is taken to imply, not the attribution of righteousness in idea, but an imparting of actual righteousness. The facts of language, however, are inexorable: we have seen that *δικαιοῦν*, *δικαιοῦσθαι* have the first sense and not the second; that they are rightly said to be "forensic"; that they have reference to a judicial verdict, and to nothing beyond. To this conclusion we feel bound to adhere, even though it should follow that the state described is (if we are pressed) a fiction, that God is

when so much has been said, and the two blessings have been thus distinguished in thought and assigned definite theological names, it must never be forgotten that in actual life they are inseparable. In the order of thought justification precedes sanctification. But together the blessings stand or fall. If a man is justified we may be sure that he is being sanctified, however imperfect his condition may be. If he is not being sanctified, he has fallen from his state of grace, and can no longer be regarded as "justified."

II. *The meritorious Cause of Justification.*

On this point the teaching of the Article is clear and distinct. The meritorious cause of our justification is the atoning work of Christ. **We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ** (*propter meritum Domini, etc.*), . . . **and not for our own works or deservings** (*non propter opera et merita nostra*). It will be observed that the same preposition, "for" (*propter*), is used in both clauses, whereas when faith is mentioned in connection with justification an entirely different preposition, "by" (*per*), is employed. It is

regarded as dealing with men rather by the ideal standard of what they may be than by the actual standard of what they are. What this means is, that when a man makes a great change, such as that which the first Christians made when they embraced Christianity, he is allowed to start on his career with a clean record; his sin-stained past is not reckoned against him. The change is the great thing; it is that at which God looks. As with the prodigal son in the parable, the breakdown of his pride and rebellion in the one cry, "Father, I have sinned," is enough. The father does not wait to be gracious. He does not put him upon a long term of probation, but reinstates him at once in the full privilege of sonship. The justifying verdict is nothing more than the "best robe" and the "ring" and the "fatted calf" of the parable (Luke xv. 22 f.)."—Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 36.

important to dwell on this, because it shows that the real antithesis in the Article (as in Scripture) is not between faith and works, but between the merit and work of our Saviour and human merit and work, *i.e.* between receiving salvation as God's free gift, and *earning* it by our own efforts. That the meritorious cause of justification is the merit and atoning work of our Saviour, is recognised as fully and frankly by the Church of Rome as it is by the Church of England; and indeed it is hard to see how it can be questioned *theoretically* by any except those who would deny altogether the need of the atonement. And yet there can be no doubt that *practically* the medieval system did tend to make men rely on their own merits as the cause of their justification,¹ and led to the notion that they could *earn* it by what they did; while in the opposite quarter there are traces of the same error among some of the Anabaptists.² This error, it is to be hoped, has entirely passed away at the present day; and we may therefore proceed at once to the next subject that demands consideration.

III. *The Instrument or formal Cause of Justification.*

This the Article asserts to be *faith*. **We are**

¹ So in the Article "Of Rites and Ceremonies," in the Ten Articles of 1536 after an enumeration of a number of "laudable customs, rites, and ceremonies not to be condemned and cast away, but to be used and continued," it was felt to be necessary to add the reminder, that "none of these ceremonies have power to remit sin, but only to stir and lift up our minds unto God, by whom only our sins are forgiven."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 16.

² "They [the Anabaptists] boste themselves to be ryghtuous and to please God, not purely and absolutely for Christes sake, but for theyr owne mortification of themselves, for theyr owne good workes and persecucion, if they suffre any."—Hermann's *Consultation*, fol. cxlii. (English translation of 1548), quoted in Hardwick, p. 99.

accounted righteous . . . by¹ faith (per fidem).
**. . . Wherefore that we are justified by faith
 only** (sola fide) **is a most wholesome doctrine,
 and very full of comfort.**

There are several matters here which require elucidation—

(a) The meaning of “faith.”

(b) The meaning of the expression “we are justified by faith *only*.”

(c) The reason why faith is the instrument of justification.

(a) *The meaning of “faith.”*—There is no Hebrew word exactly answering to our term “faith.” The verb signifying to believe, to trust, is אָמַן, which the LXX. habitually render by πιστεύειν, from the important passage, Gen. xv. 6, onwards: “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness” (LXX. καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην). This is one of the two great passages on which S. Paul bases his doctrine of justification by faith. But there is in Hebrew no substantive meaning *faith as an active principle*, i.e. trustfulness, or the frame of mind which relies upon another. The nearest approach is found in אָמִינָה, firmness or constancy, which is variously rendered by the LXX. ἀλήθεια, πίστις, or by an adjective, ἀληθινός, πιστός, ἀξίόπιστος. The word, however, is rather *passive* than *active*, signifying *trustworthiness*, or the frame of mind that can be relied on; although in Hab. ii. 4 (S. Paul’s other great text) it seems to have a double or “transitional”

¹ “By” in old English is ordinarily equivalent to “through.” Cf. Lightfoot *On Revision*, p. 119: “Where in common language we now say ‘by’ and ‘through’ (i.e. by means of) respectively, our translators, following the diction of their age, generally use ‘of’ and ‘by’ respectively; ‘of’ denoting the agent (ὅτι), and ‘by’ the instrument or means (διὰ).”

sense. "The just shall live by faith" (LXX. ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται). Here it is hard to say whether אֱמוּנָה and πίστις represent "trustfulness" (active) or "trustworthiness" (passive): in fact, the two ideas seem to be blended together. But when we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we find πίστις definitely stamped with the *active* sense, and as a Christian virtue it has the meaning of *trust* or *belief*.¹ Still it is employed with considerable variations of meaning, from the bare sense of "belief" or intellectual assent, as when S. James says that "the devils *believe* (πιστεύουσι) and tremble" (S. James ii. 19), rising to that "faith which worketh by love" (πίστις δι' ἀγαπῆς ἐνεργουμένη, Gal. v. 6), to which all the achievements of the Old Testament saints are attributed in Heb. xi. This last is the sense in which it is ordinarily used by S. Paul; and since he is the apostle who speaks of man being "justified by faith," it is evident that this is the sense in which the word is to be understood in the Article. Faith, then, is a principle of trust and reliance on God and His promises, which leads to practical action and issues in good works.²

(b) *The meaning of the expression "we are justified by faith only."*—This faith the Article asserts to be the instrument of our justification.

¹ See Bishop Lightfoot *On Galatians*, p. 152 *seq.*, "Excursus on the Words denoting Faith," from which the above is mainly taken; and cf. Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 31 *seq.*

² "The centre and mainspring of this higher form of faith is defined more exactly as 'faith in Jesus Christ,' Rom. iii. 22, 26. This is the crowning and characteristic sense with S. Paul; and it is really this which he has in view wherever he ascribes to faith the decisive significance which he does ascribe to it, even though the object is not expressed (as in i. 17, iii. 27 ff., v. 1, 2). We have seen that it is not merely assent or adhesion, but *enthusiastic* adhesion, personal adhesion: the highest and most effective motive power of which human character is capable."—Sanday and Headlam, *ubi supra*.

We are accounted righteous . . . by faith (per fidem). The expression is strictly Biblical, and is drawn from Rom. iii. 28–30: “We reckon that a man is justified by faith (πίστει, Vulg. *per fidem*) apart from the works of the law. . . . He shall justify the circumcision by faith (ἐκ πίστεως) and the uncircumcision through faith” (διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Vulg. *per fidem*); cf. Gal. ii. 16. Thus the Article keeps close to the actual language of the Apostle, and assigns to faith no other position than that of an instrument. Luther unhappily was not always so careful, and actually used language which would imply that faith was the meritorious cause of justification; asserting—what Holy Scripture never says—that we are justified *on account of* (propter) faith.¹ In such language, it is perhaps needless to say, the Church of England has never followed him.

But the Article is not content with assigning to faith the position of *an* instrument; it speaks of it as if it were the *sole* instrument. “**We are justified by faith only**” (sola fide). This expression, it must be admitted, is not contained directly in Scripture. But that faith *is* (in some sense) the sole instrument may be fairly inferred from the passage quoted above from Rom. iii. 28, where S. Paul speaks of men being “justified by *faith apart from the works of the law.*” Compare also Rom. iv. 2–5, ix. 30; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 5 seq. In these passages the Apostle does not merely speak of faith as instrumental in justification, but expressly excludes “works.”

On the other hand, S. James in his Epistle expressly includes “works,” and denies that man is justified by “faith only” (ἐκ πίστεως μόνον, Vulg. *ex fide tantum*), c. ii. 14–26: “What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but have not works? can

¹ See his Comment. on Gal. ii. 16, iii. 6.

that faith save him? If a brother or a sister be naked, and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet ye give them not the things needful to the body, what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith. Thou believest that God is one; thou doest well: the devils also believe and shudder. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was his faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith. And in like manner, was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, in that she received the messengers, and sent them out another way? For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead."

This passage, *as far as words are concerned*, is certainly contrary to the teaching of S. Paul in the passages referred to above, especially Rom. iv., where the case of Abraham is considered, and his justification ascribed to faith and not works; and compare Heb. xi. 17, 31, where the *faith* of Rahab as well as of Abraham is praised.

But though the words are different, yet the *teaching* of the two Apostles is identical. Their reconciliation may be established by pointing out—

1. *The different senses which they give to πίστις*.—In S. James it is merely intellectual assent, an affair of the *head*, not of the heart. The devils "believe" (πιστεύουσι). In S. Paul, on the contrary, it is πίστις δι' ἀγαπῆς

ἐνεργουμένη, a "faith that worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6); and according to him, "with the *heart* man believeth (*πιστεύεται*) unto righteousness" (Rom. x. 10).

2. *The different senses which they give to ἔργα.*—In S. Paul's writings this word, standing without any qualifying adjective, is always used in a *depreciatory* sense. When he would speak of works which are intrinsically good, he adds the qualifying adjective *καλά* or *ἀγαθά* (see Rom. ii. 7, xiii. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 8; Eph. ii. 10, etc.). It is, however, of such *good works* that S. James is speaking,—works which are really included in that faith which is defined as one which "*worketh by love.*"

3. *The different errors before the Apostles.*—S. Paul, in contending against a self-righteous Pharisaism, which boasted of its "works," vehemently denies that such "works" can aid in man's justification. S. James, on the contrary, has before him the case of those who thought that a barren orthodoxy was sufficient, and looked for justification from the correctness of their creed. To them he therefore says that such a faith, apart from works, is dead.

There is, then, no real contradiction between the teaching of the two Apostles; and it is providential that both sides of the truth are thus stated in Scripture. The Epistle of S. James forms a valuable safeguard against the errors of the "Solifidians," who, resting on faith only (*sola fides*), denied altogether the need of good works; while the teaching of S. Paul breaks down, once for all, all human *claim* to a reward.¹

Returning now to the subject of faith as the instrument of justification, the question has to be asked: In

¹ See, further, Lightfoot *On the Galatians*, p. 162; Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 102 *seq.*; and Mayor *On S. James*, p. lxxxvii *seq.*, and 204.

what sense is it the *sole* instrument of justification? *i.e.* does it exclude good works, or the sacraments of the gospel?

With regard to the latter, if the description of justification given above is correct, and it includes (1) pardon of sin, and (2) a right and title to eternal life grounded on promise, then beyond all question it *is* granted in baptism: accordingly divines have frequently spoken of "first justification" as granted in it. It would perhaps be better to say that the exclusive term "alone," when we say that we are justified by faith alone, is only meant to exclude any other instrument on man's part for *receiving*, and is not intended to exclude God's instruments for *bestowing* justification. Thus faith is as it were the hand, and the *only* hand, which man can stretch forth to receive the blessing; while the sacraments of the gospel may be regarded as the channels through which God conveys the blessing to the faithful soul that is able to receive it.

With regard to *good works* the statement of the Article, that we are justified by faith only, is not meant in any way to exclude the necessity of good works, but only to shut them out *from the office* of justifying. That this is all that is intended is made perfectly clear by the statements of the Homily, to which the Article expressly refers us, as may be seen from the extracts quoted below in the next section. Repentance and obedience are necessary conditions or qualifications, but they are not the instruments for obtaining justification. Similarly, for a beneficial reception of the Holy Eucharist, charity is a necessary qualification; but "the *means* whereby the Body of Christ is received is faith."

(c) *The reason why faith is the instrument of justification.*—It may be said without irreverence that the reason why, in God's method of salvation, faith is selected

for this office is not because there is any special virtue in it, or because it is the greatest of all Christian graces, for charity is greater (1 Cor. xiii. 2, 13), but because faith is peculiarly fit for this particular office, since there is in it that element of self-surrender, of trust, confidence, and reliance on another, which necessarily excludes all reliance on self and our own merits. Had we been justified by something else, as love, there would have been the possibility of reliance on self, and the notion of *earning* salvation would not have been in the same way shut out. Further, it is faith which enables us to realise the unseen. It is "the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen" (Heb. xi. 1); and thus it makes things distant become near, and admits them to close embraces.

Before passing on to the next section, it may be well to call attention to the fact that the Article maintains a wise silence on more than one subject connected with the doctrine of justification by faith, which was keenly disputed between the Romans and Lutherans in the sixteenth century. It has already been mentioned that the Article, seemingly of set purpose, ignores the Lutheran statement (condemned by the Council of Trent ¹) that a man is justified if he believes himself to be justified; but besides this there are two important matters on which the Article is markedly silent, (1) the question of the presence or absence of charity in justifying faith, and (2) the theory of an "imputed" righteousness. The first of these subjects was keenly debated at the time of the Reformation. The school-

¹ "If anyone shall say that a man is absolved from his sins and justified because he assuredly believes himself to be absolved and justified; or that no one is truly justified save he who believes himself to be justified; and that by this faith alone absolution and justification are perfected: let him be anathema."—Sess. VI. canon xiv.

men in their teaching on justification had drawn a distinction between "fides informis," a bare faith, and "fides formata," a faith informed by charity,¹ and had maintained that the latter alone is instrumental in justifying. In this they are naturally followed by the Tridentine divines.² Luther, on the other hand, while accepting the distinction thus drawn, insisted that it is "fides informis" which justifies, and argues that to say the contrary is to maintain justification by works.³ The whole question is wisely ignored in the Article, though the Homily says pointedly that love is not excluded, but is "joined with faith in every man that is justified."

The second subject mentioned above, the theory of an "imputed" righteousness, is developed by Luther in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. According to it, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, and our sins are imputed to Him. It is in connection with this that the notion of a "legal fiction" comes into most prominence, and it is difficult to free the theory as it is maintained by Protestant divines from the charge of unreality. But as (like the points just noticed) there is not a word concerning it in our own Article, there is no need to consider the subject further here.

¹ See Aquinas, *Summa*, III. Q. xlix. art. 1: "Fides autem, per quam a peccato mundatur, non est fides informis, quæ potest esse etiam cum peccato, sed est fides formata per charitatem, ut sic passio Christi nobis applicatur, non solum quantum ad intellectum, sed etiam quantum ad effectum. Et per hunc etiam modum peccata dimittuntur et virtute passionis Christi." Cf. 1^{ma} 2^æ Q. cxiii. art. 4; and see Neander, *Church History*, vol. viii. pp. 220, 221, and Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 118.

² Sess. VI. canon xi.

³ *Commentary on Galatians*, ii. 17.

IV. *The Homily of Justification.*

It only remains to say a word or two on **the Homily of Justification**, to which the Article refers us for fuller treatment of the subject. On turning to the Books of the Homilies, however, we find that there exists no homily with this title! That which is evidently referred to is the "Homily of Salvation," contained in the first book; together with which should be read the two following ones "Of the True and lively Faith" and "Of Good Works." In reading these the student is especially recommended to notice the emphatic way in which the writer insists (1) that faith alone has the office of justifying, (2) that good works are necessary, and (3) that faith has no merit any more than any other graces or good works. A few quotations shall be added by way of specimens.

"Faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that, although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not all together. Nor that faith also doth not shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterward of duty towards God (for we are most bounded to serve God in doing good deeds commanded by him in his holy Scripture all the days of our life); but it excludeth them so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made good by doing of them. For all the good works that we can do be imperfect, and therefore not able to deserve our justification; but our justification doth come freely, by the mere mercy of God; and of so great and free mercy that, whereas all the world was not able of themselves to pay any part towards their ransom, it pleased our heavenly Father, of

his infinite mercy, without any our desert or deserving, to prepare for us the most precious jewels of Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied."

Again: "This sentence, that we be justified by faith only, is not so meant of them [namely, the ancient writers, Greek and Latin] that the said justifying faith is alone in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and fear of God, at any time or season. Nor when they say that we be justified freely, they mean not that we should or might afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward; neither they mean not so to be justified without our good works that we should do no good works at all, like as shall be more expressed at large hereafter. But this saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deserve our justification at God's hands; and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man and the goodness of God, the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and thereby wholly for to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only and his most precious bloodshedding."

And once more: "The true understanding of this doctrine—We be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only—is not that this our own act, to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us and deserve our justification unto us; for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves. But the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that, although we hear God's word and believe it, although we have faith, hope,

charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us, and do never so many good works thereunto, yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues of faith, hope, charity, and all our other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of our sins and our justification; and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and in that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace, and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism as of all actual sin committed by us after our baptism if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to him again. So that, as S. John Baptist, although he were never so virtuous and godly a man, yet in this matter of forgiving of sin he did put the people from him, and appointed them unto Christ, saying thus unto them, *Behold, yonder is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world*; even so, as great and as godly a virtue the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itself, and remitteth or appointeth us unto Christ, for to have only by him remission of our sins or justification. So that our faith in Christ, as it were, saith unto us thus: It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only; and to him only I send you for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ."

✓

ARTICLE XII

De Bonis Operibus.

Bona opera quæ sunt fructus fidei et justificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiare et divini judicii severitatem ferre non possunt, Deo tamen grata sunt et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut plane ex illis, æque fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu indicari.

Of Good Works.

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, in so much that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

THERE is nothing corresponding to this Article in the series of 1553. It is one of the four new Articles added by Parker at the revision in the early years of Elizabeth, a portion of the first clause being taken by him (like others of his addition) from the Confession of Württemberg,¹ while the phrase "**follow after justification**" (justificatos sequuntur) is due to S. Augustine, who uses it in his treatise, *De fide et operibus*, c. xiv.

The object of the Article is obviously to state the mind of the Church of England on the position of "good works," with reference, perhaps, to the Roman teaching on the one hand, and the exaggerations of Luther and of some who professed to be his followers on the other.

¹ "Non est autem sentiendum quod iis bonis operibus, quæ per nos facimus, in iudicio Dei ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum et placatione divinæ iræ ac merito æternæ salutis confitendum est. Omnia enim bona opera quæ nos facimus sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini iudicii ferre."—*De bonis operibus*. See Hardwick, p. 125.

(a) The Tridentine statements occur in the decrees and canons of the sixth session (held in January 1547). They follow naturally from the view of justification held by the Roman Church, and are very emphatic in their assertion of the "merit" of good works; *e.g.* "We must needs believe that to the justified nothing further is wanting, but that they may be accounted to have, by those very works which have been done in God, fully satisfied the Divine law according to the state of this life, and truly to have merited eternal life, to be obtained also in its due time if they shall have departed in grace."¹ Again: "If anyone shall say that the good works of a man that is justified are in such wise the gift of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified, or that the said justified, by the good works which are performed by him through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life, if so be, however, that he depart in grace, and, moreover, an increase of glory: let him be anathema."²

(b) On the other hand, Luther used strong expressions on the sinful character of all man's efforts. "Even the best work is a venial sin"; and yet more strongly, "Omne opus justi damnabile est et peccatum mortale, si iudicio

¹ "Nihil ipsis justificatis amplius deesse credendum est, quo minus plene illis quidem operibus quæ in Deo sunt facta, divinæ legi pro hujus vitæ statu satisfacisse, et vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratia decesserint, consequendam, vere promeruisse censeantur."—*Conc. Trident. Sessio Sexta, c. xvi.*

² "Si quis dixerit hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Deo ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam et Jesu Christi meritum, cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, et ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum: anathema sit."—*Ib. canon xxxii.*

Dei judicetur."¹ No wonder, then, that among his followers a depreciation of the need of good works of any kind was prevalent, and that Antinomianism and Solifidianism were widely spread. It is probable that it was even more in order to protect the Church against these errors than to protest against the Roman teaching that the Article was inserted,² though it is so worded as to guard against false views on either side.

The main statements of the Article may be summed up as follows :—

1. Good works are the fruits and result of faith, and the evidence of it.
2. They "follow after justification."
3. They have no merit in themselves, and cannot endure the severity of God's judgment.
4. Yet they are acceptable to God in Christ.

The Roman and Lutheran divines looked at good works from opposite sides, and were consequently led into exaggerated statements in different directions. The Anglican Article by its balanced statements endeavours to do justice to both sides of the whole truth on the subject of which it treats, and seems to recognise that in every "good work" there are two factors, a human and a Divine. In so far as the doer of the work is following the leadings of grace, it is good; in so far as he is not, there is an element of sinfulness in the work. The main points laid down in the Article seem to follow so natur-

¹ *Assert. omn. art. Opera*, tom. ii. fol. 325b, quoted in Moehler's *Symbolism*, p. 158. The Council of Trent met these assertions by the twenty-fifth canon of the Sixth Session: "Si quis in quolibet bono opere justum saltem venialiter peccare dixerit, aut quod intolerabilius est, mortaliter, atque ideo poenas æternas mereri, tantumque ob id non damnari, quia Deus ea opera non imputet ad damnationem: anathema sit."

² Parker writes in 1559, "They say that the realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Freewill men," etc. Parker's *Correspondence* (Parker Society), p. 61.

ally from the teaching of Article XI. on justification by faith, that they require but little explanation and no formal Scriptural proof. It may, however, be well to point out that in the statement that **good works . . . follow after justification**, the "good works" of which this Article is speaking are clearly external works, or that actual obedience which produces a course of actions. Repentance, which from one point of view might certainly be termed a "good work," cannot possibly be referred to, because it precedes and does not "follow after justification."¹ The phrase, as we have seen, is due to S. Augustine, and, as Waterland says, by it Augustine "meant no more than that men must be incorporated in Christ, must be Christians, and good Christians (for such only are justified), before they could practise Christian works or righteousness, strictly so called: for such works only have an eminent right and title to the name of good works, as they only are salutary within the covenant, and have a claim upon the promise. Works before justification, *i.e.* before salutary baptism, are not, in his account, within the promise."² The expression in the Article must be understood in the same way, and not pressed so as to make it imply that nothing good can

¹ "Bona opera" had apparently come to have almost a technical sense for definite *Christian* works. Gardiner in his *Declaration* (fol. xxxviii.) distinguishes carefully between "bona opera" which follow after justification, and "opera poenitentiae" which precede it. See Hardwick, p. 401; and the Tridentine decrees seem carefully to avoid speaking of "good works" as done before justification, while anathematising the view that "*all* works which are done before justification are truly sins."—Sess. VI. canon vii.

² *Summary View of the Doctrine of Justification*, Works, vol. vi. p. 21; cf. Bp. Bull, *Harmony of Justification*, p. 55. "Augustine is certainly not to be understood of every work, but of a long continuance of works, so that his meaning may be this: the works which precede justification are less and fewer than those which follow it. Without some explanation of this kind, that maxim, so often used, will with difficulty be freed from an evident falsehood."

possibly precede justification,—a position which, as will be shown under the following article, could not be established from Scripture, and one to which the Church of England is certainly not committed. That, then, to which this Article is intended to bind us is this, namely, that, as justification comes at the *beginning* of the Christian life, “good works” properly so called must be subsequent to it, and that they are the natural and necessary outcome of that faith by which a man is justified.

Waterland’s conclusion on the whole subject which has been considered in these two Articles (XI. and XII.) is worth quoting: “Take we due care so to maintain the doctrine of faith as not to exclude the necessity of good works, and so to maintain good works as not to exclude the necessity of Christ’s atonement, or the free grace of God. Take we care to perform all evangelical duties to the utmost of our power, aided by God’s Spirit; and when we have so done, say that we are unprofitable servants, having no strict claim to a reward, but yet looking for one and accepting it as a favour, not challenging it as due in any right of our own: due only upon free promise, and that promise made, not in consideration of any deserts of ours, but in and through the alone merits, active and passive, of Jesus Christ our Lord.”¹

¹ *Summary View*, etc., p. 38.

ARTICLE XIII

Opera ante Justificationem.

Opera quæ fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et Spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt: neque gratiam (ut multi vocant) de congruo merentur: Imo cum non sint facta ut Deus illa fieri voluit et præcepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

Of Works before Justification.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin.

THIS Article has remained unchanged since the publication of the Edwardian Series in 1553. There is nothing corresponding to it in the Augsburg Confession, nor has its language been traced to any earlier source. Its object is evidently to condemn the scholastic theory of congruous merit.

The subjects which require consideration in connection with it are these—

1. The title as compared with the Article itself.
2. The scholastic theory of congruous merit.
3. The teaching of the Article upon the subject.

I. The Title as compared with the Article itself.

It will be noticed that whereas the title speaks of **works before justification**, in the body of the Article

the phrase is not repeated, but a different one takes its place. **Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit.** The question then at once arises, Are these two expressions strictly convertible terms? The answer to this must depend on the reply given to another question, Is grace ever given before justification? If *not*, the two expressions, "works before justification," and "works before grace," may be regarded as convertible; but if it should appear that grace is sometimes given before justification, then it will be evident that the title of the Article is too wide, and must be limited by the expression actually used in the Article itself. The question as to the relation of grace to justification is one which must be decided strictly by the testimony of Holy Scripture, and it is believed that there is ample evidence to establish the fact that grace may be given before justification. As Bishop Bull says: "The truth is that no work really good can precede the grace of God, since without that grace it cannot be performed. But good works may precede justification, and actually do precede it; for grace is given before justification, that we may perform those things by which we arrive at justification."¹ For proof of this it is sufficient to refer to two representative instances: (a) On the day of Pentecost, after the address of the Apostle Peter to the multitude, we read, "They were pricked in their heart (κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν), and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do" (Acts ii. 37)? Here, without doubt, was the grace of God at work. The grace of *compunction* was granted; but the reply of S. Peter shows equally clearly that even so those who had thus received grace were not yet justified. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *unto the remission of your*

¹ *Harmony of Justification*, p. 162.

sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” (b) Again, it will scarcely be doubted that S. Paul received grace at the moment of his conversion. “Behold, he prayeth,” was the message which came to Ananias (Acts ix. 11), and that prayer can only have been offered up and rendered acceptable by the action of the Holy Spirit upon his heart. But, strictly speaking, he was not *justified* for three days after his “conversion”; for when Ananias came to him his words were these, “And now, why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*” (Acts xxii. 16).

There is, then, a real discrepancy between the title of this Thirteenth Article and the substance of it, and so much was practically confessed by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who suggested as an emendation that the Article itself should run as follows: “Works done *before justification by Christ and regeneration by His Spirit*, are not pleasing unto God,” etc.¹ This emendation, of course, brings the Article into conformity with the title, but at the expense of truth; and, as things actually are, there can be no question that *the title must be interpreted by the Article*, which speaks not of *all*, but only of *some* “works before justification,” viz. those which precede the action of God’s grace in the heart of man. The origin of the discrepancy which thus exists has been traced by Archdeacon Hardwick to an earlier draft of the Article. As was mentioned in the Introduction,² there still exists in the Record Office a MS. copy of the Articles, signed by the six royal chaplains, to whom they were submitted before their final revision and publication, and

¹ See Neal’s *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 561. The Assembly also suggested a change in the closing words of the Article, substituting “*they are sinful*” for the far milder phrase, “We doubt not that they have the nature of sin.”

² See vol. i. p. 13.

in this we find that in the Article itself we have the expression: "Opera quæ fiunt ante justificationem cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant," etc.¹ It is evident that Cranmer and those working with him afterwards felt that this was inaccurate, and therefore modified the wording of the Article before publication, introducing the phrase which we now read in it, "Works before the grace of Christ," etc., although the old title was still allowed to remain, inexact though it was.

II. *The Scholastic Theory of Congruous Merit.*

The object of the Article, as has been already stated, is to repudiate the erroneous teaching of some of the **school-authors**² on the subject of grace. The school-authors, or schoolmen here referred to, are the divines of the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation: S. Bernard (1115) being generally reckoned as the "last of the Fathers," and S. Anselm (1109) or Peter Lombard, the "Master of the Sentences" (1164), the first of the schoolmen.³ We are here concerned, how-

¹ See Hardwick, p. 281.

² The Latin of the Article has merely "ut *multi* vocant." The regular name for the schoolmen in Latin is "scholastici" (cf. Art. XXIII. of 1553, *doctrina Scholasticorum*), a name which tells us nothing about the men themselves, except that they belonged to the "schools," either as teachers or learners.

³ The change of name is significant. The Fathers, "Patres," as Archbishop Trench points out, were productive, bringing out of their treasure things new and old. The schoolmen, on the contrary, were content simply to vindicate and establish the old. "The more illustrious teachers of earlier periods of the Church had found each his own special and peculiar work to perform, his own position to make good. Occupied with this, they had not found the inclination or the leisure for a deliberate oversight of the whole field of theology; they had not mapped it out as it demanded to be mapped out. It was to this that the schoolmen addressed themselves—to the organising after a true scientific method the rude undigested mass which lay before

ever, not with the men, nor with the scholastic system as a whole, but simply with one particular portion of it, namely, its teaching on grace. In reasoning on this subject, some among the schoolmen had come to teach a doctrine which is, to say the least, seriously tainted with semi-Pelagianism; for they maintained that man might be entitled to receive initial grace as the reward of actions done in his own strength without the aid of God's Holy Spirit. Starting from the view that the Fall only involved the loss of the *donum supernaturale*, and left man with moral and religious faculties belonging to him by nature, they taught that the exercise of these faculties was the natural transition to grace, and that a good use of them was the medium of grace, or, in their phraseology, merited it *of congruity* (de congruo). God, they said, was not bound to reward such actions, but it was congruous or fitting that He should. But after grace was received, the work done in dependence on the aid of the Holy Spirit was really good, and this God was bound to reward, crowning His own gifts in man. Such actions deserved grace *de condigno*, and for them God was a debtor. The stock instance to which they made their appeal was the case of Cornelius (Acts x.), whose "prayers and alms came up for a memorial before God," and drew down God's grace upon him. The true explanation of such a case as this will be given in the next section. For the present, it is sufficient to notice that the theory, as popularly represented, opens the door to Pelagianism, and makes (at least in some cases) the *beginning* of man's

them." Thus their work was to adjust the relations of the various parts of theological learning, and to draw up in "Sums of Theology" the complete doctrine of the Church to which they professed implicit obedience. And further, they set themselves to "justify to the reason that which had first been received by faith," explaining the "how" and the "why" of the Church's teaching, and vindicating the rational character of supernatural truth. See Trench's *Medieval Church History*, Lect. xiv.

salvation his own act. Moreover, it brought back into the Church the conception of *earning* a reward, against which S. Paul's whole teaching on grace was directed.¹ The scholastic opinions and distinctions, however, on this subject have never been formally adopted by the Church of Rome. The idea of congruous merit was rightly condemned as bordering on Pelagianism by some of the Tridentine divines, and the decrees of the Council avoided altogether the phrases *meritum de congruo* and *de condigno*; and while, on the one hand, they guarded against Pelagianism by anathematising anyone who should say "that without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and His help, man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent, as he ought, so that the grace of justification may be conferred upon him,"² on the other hand they condemned the assertion that "*all* works done before justification, in what manner soever they be done, are truly sins, or deserve the hatred of God."³

III. *The Teaching of the Article upon the Subject.*

In considering what the teaching of the Article really is, it is important to remember the exact phrase to which attention has been previously drawn, "Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit," and also to bear in mind the fact already

¹ The illustration commonly given to explain the scholastic distinction brings this out very clearly. A servant, it is said, deserves his wages *de condigno*: he may deserve support in sickness or old age *de congruo*.

² "Si quis dixerit, sine præveniente Spiritus Sancti inspiratione, atque ejus adjutorio, hominem credere, sperare, diligere, aut pœnitere posse, sicut oportet, ut ei justificationis gratia conferatur: anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. VI. canon iii. Jan. 13. 1547

³ "Si quis dixerit opera omnia quæ ante justificationem fiunt, quæcumque ratione facta sint, vere esse peccata, vel odium Dei mereri, aut quanto vehementius quis nititur se disponere ad gratiam, tanto eum gravius peccare: anathema sit."—Canon vii.

established, that grace may be and sometimes is given before justification. When due weight is given to these two considerations, it will be seen that there is really nothing in the Article which in any way depreciates the good works of those who, born in an inferior system, make such use of the opportunities granted to them as to draw down further blessings upon them. Article X. has asserted that "the condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God." The Article before us supplements this by maintaining that **works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or . . . deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin.**

What it is intended to deny in each case is the semi-Pelagian notion, revived by some of the schoolmen, that in certain cases the *initiative* in the work of salvation rests with man. But we are not called upon by subscribing these Articles either to deny that God looks with favour upon the good deeds of men who are outside His covenant, or to maintain that the virtues of the heathen are really sins. All we deny is that they "deserve grace of congruity"; for if grace be a supernatural gift freely bestowed by God on men in order that they may attain eternal life, then certainly grace is found working outside the Christian covenant, and influencing men before they are (in theological language) "justified."¹ Wherever, then, a work that is really good can be found

¹ "They who acknowledge no grace of God, save that one only which is infused in justification, or who contend that at least that one goes before

done by men trained in any system, it is to be ascribed to the action of God's grace, and not to the man's own unaided efforts.¹ Thus in the case of Cornelius, to which the upholders of the doctrine of congruous merit made their appeal, we may fearlessly assert that his "prayers and alms" were "pleasant and acceptable to God" (*grata Deo*), for so much is involved in the statement that they "came up for a memorial before God" (Acts x. 4). But we deny that they were due to "his own natural strength." We deny also that they "deserved

all others, greatly err; since they cannot deny that faith at least precedes justification in nature, which faith we certainly have not from ourselves, but from the preventing grace of Christ. More rightly, therefore, do other Protestants, who are more sound and moderate, willingly concede that various disposing and preparing acts, produced in us through the Holy Ghost assisting, and not by the sole powers of our freewill, are required before justification, though most of them deny to these acts any power of justifying."—Bp. W. Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, vol. i. p. 25.

¹ Hardwick (*Articles*, p. 402) quotes in illustration of this the following from Bishop Woolton's *Christian Manual*, p. 43 (Ed. Parker Society): "Albeit the works of heathen men are not to be compared with the good works of faithful men engrafted in the Church of Christ; yet for many causes, and principally for that without all controversy, all good gifts and endowments even in the paynims, are God's good gifts, they have the title and name of good works in some respects given unto them." Cf. *The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. p. 337: "The principle underlying Article XIII. seems to me to be this, that there are not two totally different modes of access to God for men, faith for Christians, meritorious performance for non-Christians. There is but one mode of access, faith; and but one perfect, and, as it were, normal faith, that which rests on the revelation in the person of Jesus Christ. But faith itself, not being an intellectual assent to propositions, but an attitude of heart and mind, is present in a more or less rudimentary state in every upward effort and aspiration of men. Doubtless the faith of non-Christians (and much of the faith of Christians for that matter) is not in the strict sense "faith in Jesus Christ"; and therefore I wish the Article were otherwise worded. But such faith, when ripened, grows into the faith of Jesus Christ; as also it finds its rational justification in the revelation made through Him. Practically the principle of the Article teaches us to regard all the good there is in the world as what one may call *imperfect Christianity*, not as something essentially different, requiring, so to speak, to be dealt with by God in a wholly different manner."

grace of congruity," for we maintain that they were actually done by the aid of Divine grace, and that thus, although they were done "before justification," they cannot truly be described as "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit"; for, as Augustine says, "Whatever of good works Cornelius performed as well before he believed in Christ as when he believed, and after he had believed, are *all to be ascribed to God*."¹

¹ *De Prædest. Sanctorum*, c. vii.

ARTICLE XIV

De Operibus Supererogationis.

Opera quæ supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate prædicari. Nam illis declarant homines non tantum se Deo reddere quæ tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere quam deberent: cum aperte Christus dicat: Cum feceritis omnia quæcunque præcepta sunt vobis, dicite: Servi inutiles sumus.

Of Works of Supererogation.

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We be unprofitable servants.

THIS Article dates from 1553, the only change made in it in Elizabeth's reign being the substitution of "impiety" for "iniquity," as more accurately representing the Latin "impietate."¹

Its object is, of course, to condemn the Romish teaching on "works of supererogation." The same teaching is also condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in a passage which admirably illustrates the article: "Tum et illorum arrogantia comprimenda est, et autoritate legum domanda, qui supererogationis opera quædam importaverunt, quibus existimant non solum cumulate Dei legibus, et explete satisfieri, sed aliquid etiam in illis amplius superesse quam Dei mandata

¹ In 1553 and 1563 the title was "Opera Supererogationis." The change to its present form was made in 1571.

postulent, unde et sibi mereri et aliis merita applicari possint.”¹

The subjects which require consideration in explanation of the Article are these—

1. The name “works of supererogation.”
2. The history of the growth of the system of indulgences.
3. The theological defence offered for them, involving works of supererogation, and the teaching of Scripture on the subject.

I. *The Name “Works of Supererogation.”*

The word **supererogation** comes directly from the Latin. Starting with the simple verb “rogare,” we note that in classical writers it is used, sometimes with “legem” or “populum” after it, sometimes absolutely, in a technical sense, meaning “to ask the people about a law,” and so simply to “propose a bill,” or “introduce a law.” Hence the compound verb “erogare” was used in connection with a money bill, and came to mean “to pay out money from the public treasury, after asking the consent of the people,” and so more generally, beyond the sphere of public law, to “expend” or “disburse money.”² From this the double compound “supererogare” was formed with the meaning, to “pay over and above,” equivalent to the Greek *προσδαπανᾶν*. As such its earliest occurrence is in the Latin versions of the New Testament, where it appears in S. Luke x. 35 in the parable of the Good Samaritan, “Whatsoever thou spendest more”: *Quodcunque supererogaveris*. This rendering was current before the days of S. Jerome,

¹ *De Hæres.* c. 8: “De perfectione justificatorum, et de operibus supererogationis.”

² Thus in the Latin of Codex Bezae “erogasset” stands for *δαπανησάντος* in S. Luke xv. 14.

being found in the writings of S. Ambrose,¹ as well as in some MSS. of the "Old Latin";² but it was its adoption in the Vulgate that made it the common property of Western Christendom.³ From it in later times the substantive "supererogatio" was formed, and the phrase "opera supererogationis" was adopted by ecclesiastical writers as the technical name for the "excess of merit" attributed to the saints, and for what the Article calls **voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments**. In this sense it was used not infrequently by writers of the thirteenth century, such as Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas; but until this period it is doubtful whether the phrase is ever found, or whether the verb occurs except in direct connection with S. Luke x. 35.

II. *The History of the Growth of the System of Indulgences.*

It was the open sale of indulgences, which was closely connected with the doctrine of works of supererogation, that first roused the indignation of Luther, and led to the revolt from the Papacy. But the doctrine and the practice only grew up very gradually, step by step, with no perception on the part of anyone of what the ultimate outcome of it all would be. The starting-point, in tracing out its history, may be found in very early days,

¹ S. Ambrose, *Hom. vii. in Lucam*.

² Sabatier gives it as found in *Codd. Veron. and Brix. Cod. Vercellensis* has "amplius erogaveris," which is the rendering found in Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. cxxv. 15*, although in *Quæst. Evangel. II. xix.* he has *supererogare*.

³ The "Rhemish New Testament" (1st ed. 1582) attempted to Anglicise the verb, and rendered S. Luke x. 35: "Whatsoever thou dost supererogate"; but it was found impossible to naturalise the clumsy Latinism, and it was withdrawn in the Douay version (1609), which is content with the natural rendering, "spend over and above."

in the regard for (1) martyrdom, and (2) virginity, felt by the primitive Church.

1. It was only natural that the memory of those who had laid down their lives for the faith of Christ should be held in the greatest honour, and that their intercessions should be regarded as especially efficacious, and should be eagerly sought after. And as there were many "Confessors" who had suffered mutilation or banishment for the same cause, without being called upon to seal their testimony with their lives, it was equally natural that the same feelings of regard and admiration should be extended to them also. From this sprang, during the persecution of Decius, what we can only call the first form of indulgences. During this persecution, which raged so fiercely at Carthage in the middle of the third century, while there were many noble instances of men confessing their faith bravely, and enduring whatever was inflicted upon them rather than deny their Master, yet there were also many cases of grievous apostasy. Some Christians under the stress of persecution went so far as to deny Christ altogether, and to sacrifice to the gods of the heathen (*sacrificati*); others offered incense (*thurificati*); others obtained tickets (*libelli*), declaring that they had thus cleared themselves from the crime of Christianity (*libellatici*). With these different cases the Church was called upon to deal; and under the wise guidance of S. Cyprian she determined that the peace of the Church might be granted to those who through weakness had lapsed, but that a time of penitential discipline must first be passed by them to test and prove their sorrow. Some, however, of the lapsed were impatient, and could ill brook the delay of communion. They therefore persuaded the Confessors to intercede for them, and ask for their readmission to the sacraments of the Church. It will easily be seen that it was difficult for the authorities to refuse the request

of these men who had suffered so much for the Church, and unfortunately some of the Confessors were not proof against the moral dangers to which these appeals to their kindness exposed them. Not content with interceding for the lapsed, they claimed the right to restore them to the peace of the Church, and to grant sometimes to a lapsed person and his friends (*cum suis libelli pacis*,¹ or tickets to admit them to communion without having undergone the penitential discipline imposed upon them. Here, then, we meet with a form of "indulgence," *i.e.* a shortening or remission of canonical penance. But clearly there was in itself nothing beyond the power of the Church in granting this. The claim of the Confessors to grant it in their own right was steadily resisted by Cyprian; but the Church, which had imposed the penance, and to which the power of "binding and loosing" had been granted by Christ Himself,² was within her rights in shortening the time, and readmitting to communion those of whose true repentance she was assured. The whole episode, however, required to be noticed here, because historically the "*libelli pacis*" form a sort of precedent for the indulgences of the medieval Church, though, as will presently be shown, these claimed to be far wider reaching than anything which had ever entered the minds of the Confessors who granted the original "*libelli*."

2. The special reverence with which the early Church regarded virginity is well known. It is based on the teaching of S. Paul in 1 Cor. vii., in which, though he permits marriage, he certainly expresses a preference—under the then existing conditions—for the unmarried state. "Concerning virgins" he has "no commandment

¹ S. Cyprian, *Ep.* xv. See on the whole subject Archbishop Benson's article "*Libelli*" in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 981.

² S. Matt. xviii. 18.

(*præceptum*) of the Lord," but he gives his "judgment" (*consilium*),¹ and advises that such remain single. From these words grew the distinction subsequently drawn between "precepts," which all were bound to obey, and "counsels," which it was not *necessary* for a person to follow. From this it was only a step to teach that by following the "counsels" it was possible for a Christian to do more than was required of him by God, and hence the notion of a special "merit" attaching to the state of virginity and to other special states or conditions. This idea was greatly encouraged by the devotion to the monastic life which is so marked in the latter part of the fourth century; and from this time onward it is generally recognised that there are two kinds of life within the Church, the one for ordinary Christians mixing in the world, in which men are permitted to marry, and to engage in the ordinary business of life, though strictly bound to keep the "commandments" of God; the other, which is above the ordinary life of men, in which the "counsels of perfection" are carried out, those who are thus aiming at being "perfect" selling all their possessions (cf. S. Matt. xix. 21), abstaining from marriage, and devoting themselves entirely to the service of God.²

These facts require to be borne in mind, although their full significance and the use that might be made of them did not appear for several centuries. The system of a commutation of penance for money, which was introduced about the seventh century through the "Penitentials," cannot have failed to be seriously injurious to the moral sense of Christendom, however innocent may have been

¹ Cf. also 2 Cor. viii. 8 and 10, where *consilium* occurs again. The distinction is recognised by S. Augustine, and is used by him to illustrate S. Luke x. 35; *Quest. Evangel.* II. xix., and *Enarr. in Ps.* cxxv. 15.

² Cf. Cheetham's *Church History*, p. 349.

its original intention.¹ But the system of "Indulgences" proper is scarcely found before the eleventh century and the time of the Crusades.² It is confessed on all sides that this great movement marks an epoch in the history of indulgences, and that practically a new departure was taken at the Council of Clermont (1095), when Urban II. declared that to those who would take up arms against the Infidel, he remitted the penance due to their sins, and promised to those who should die in the combat the pardon of their sins and life eternal;³ and when the Council formulated their decision in these words—

"Whosoever shall go to Jerusalem to liberate the Church of God out of pure devotion, and not for the purpose of obtaining honour or money, let the journey be counted in him of all penance."⁴

From this time may be said to date the medieval system, whereby an "Indulgence" or remission of penance, and of some or all of the *temporal* penalties attached to sin, was granted in return for certain acts of devotion whereby the Church profited. Such indulgences were granted, not only to those who "took the Cross," but to those who took part in the building of churches and cathedrals, and in many other pious acts, so that practically the expenditure of a certain sum of money could always secure them, and the line between this and the actual sale of an indulgence for money was a very

¹ On the Penitential System and the Commutation of Penance see Strong's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 314 and 342, where the good and evil of the system are both frankly recognised.

² There are, however, indications of something like it in the ninth century, when John VIII. (882) said that those who had been killed in war against the heathen, fighting for the Church, received life eternal; and that he gave them *absolution, as much as he had power to do*. See Lépicier, *History of Indulgences*, p. 189.

³ *Synodalis Concilio Urbani II.*, Mansi, xx. p. 821.

⁴ "Quicumque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniæ adeptione ad liberandum Ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni pœnitentia reputetur."—*Ib.* p. 816.

thin one, and not easy to discern. Originally the idea may have been only of the remission of canonical penance; but it very soon came to mean a great deal more than this. The canonical penance did not exhaust the *temporal*, as distinct from the *eternal*, penalties of sin; ¹ and since "purgatory" was a part of the temporal penalty, the indulgence was supposed to avail for a remission of a part or all of the pains to be there undergone. Moreover, the indulgence could be used for others than the person who performed the meritorious act, and could thus be transferred to the account of the departed, and used for the benefit of the souls in purgatory; ² and since it was called indiscriminately "remissio," "relaxatio," and "venia peccatorum," and was said to be granted *a culpa et a venia*,³ the door was opened to the notion that

¹ It is necessary to remember carefully this distinction. According to the theory which underlies the granting of indulgences, even after the sin is forgiven and its guilt (*culpa*) pardoned, there always remains a certain amount of temporal penalty (*pœna*) still to be paid either here or in purgatory. The beginning of this is seen in Albertus Magnus: "Delet gratia finalis peccatum veniale in ipsa dissolutione corporis et animæ, etc.: Hoc ab antiquis dictum est; sed nunc communiter tenetur, quod peccatum veniale cum hinc deferatur a multis, etiam quantum ad culpam, in purgatoria purgatur."—*In Compend. Theol. Verit.* iii. 13, quoted in Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 165. Still more definite is the statement of the Council of Trent: "Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam cuilibet peccatori penitenti ita culpam remitti et reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo vel in futuro in purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit: anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, Sessio vi. canon 30.

² According to the formal theory of the Church of Rome, as laid down by Sixtus IV. in a Constitution of 1477, indulgences for the departed only avail *per modum suffragii*, i.e. "the Church has no direct power over the souls of the departed. She can but humbly entreat God to accept the merits of Christ, and, having respect to them, mercifully to remit the whole or a portion of the pains due to the souls suffering in purgatory" (Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 485). If this is all, it is impossible for the person who procures the indulgence to know whether it has been of any avail at all.

³ There was no doubt that this form was anciently used; but the Council of Constance (1418) decreed that all indulgences granted with this formula

it involved a promise of eternal forgiveness ; and thus the grossest errors and superstitions were admitted and, it cannot be doubted, were encouraged by the authorities in order to fill the coffers of the Church. Thus an enormous stimulus was given to the system by the institution of the "Jubilee" in the year 1300, when Boniface VIII. offered "the fullest forgiveness of sins" to all those who for fifteen days should devoutly visit the churches of S. Peter and S. Paul in Rome.¹ This naturally drew a vast crowd of pilgrims to the city, and greatly enriched the Church ; consequently, instead of being held at the expiration of every hundred years, as was originally intended, the period was shortened, first to fifty years by Clement VI. by his famous Bull "Unigenitus," in which he boldly expounded the doctrine of the "treasury of the Church" committed to the successors of S. Peter ;² then by Urban VI. to thirty-three years (1389) ; and finally by Paul II. to twenty-five (1470). Naturally, protests were raised from time to time,³ but in spite of them the system which evoked the scorn of devout Churchmen like Dante,⁴

were revoked and annulled ; and Benedict XIV. (*De Syn. Diœc.* xiii. 18. 7) holds that all such are spurious ; while modern writers say that if the phrase remission of sins occurs in the grant of an indulgence, it means the remission of punishment. See Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 482.

¹ The words of the Bull are these : "Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam suorum concedimus veniam peccatorum." On the Jubilee see Robertson, *Church History*, vol. vi. p. 326 *seq.*

² Cf. Neander, *Church History*, vol. ix. p. 59 (Eng. tr.).

³ See an account of some of the earlier and less known protests in Neander, *Church History*, vol. vii. p. 487. The later denunciations of the whole system by Wiclif, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague are well known. See Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, vol. i. p. 325.

⁴ See *Paradiso*, Canto xxix. l. 123-115—

"Ora si va con motti, e con iscede,
A predicare, e pur che ben si rida,
Gonfia il cappuccio, e più non si richiede,
Ma tale uccel nel beccchetto s' annida,
Che se 'l vulgo il vedesse, vederebbe
La perdonanza, di che si confida,

as well as of Chaucer¹ and Langland,² grew into the scandal of the open sale of indulgences by Tetzels and the "quæstores." At the beginning of the sixteenth century, in the words of the Roman Catholic historian, Lingard, the preachers, "not content with their sermons from the pulpit, offered indulgences in the streets and markets, in taverns and in private houses; they even taught, if we may credit the interested declamation of their adversary, that every contributor, if he paid on his own account, infallibly opened to himself the gates of heaven; if on account of the dead, instantly liberated a soul from the prison of purgatory."³

III. *The Theological Defence offered for Indulgences, involving Works of Supererogation, and the Teaching of Scripture on the Subject.*

It has been necessary to give this brief sketch of the growth of the practical system of indulgences, because it

Per cui tanta stoltezza in terra crebbe,
 Che sanza pruova d' alcun testimonio
 Ad ogne promession si converrebbe.
 Now is our preaching done with jestings slight
 And mockings, and if men but laugh agape,
 The cowl puffs out, nor ask men if 'tis right;
 Yet such a bird doth nestle in their cape,
 That if the crowd beheld it, they would know
 What pardons they rely on for escape.
 And thus such madness there on earth doth grow,
 That without proof of any evidence,
 To each Indulgence eager crowds will flow."

—Plumptre's Translation.

¹ See the description of the "Pardonere," "That streit was comen from the court of Rome," in the prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*—

"His wallet lay beforne him in his lappe,
 Bret-ful of pardon come from Rome al hote."

² *Piers the Plowman*, Passus I. l. 66 seq. Pass. X. l. 316 seq.

³ Lingard, *History of England*, vol. iv. c. vii. Cf. for the state of things in England at a somewhat earlier period, Gascoyne's *Liber Veritatum*, p. 123.

is only in connection with them that the notion of "works of supererogation" came into prominence. Nothing is more certain from history than the fact of the gradual growth of the system, bit by bit, without any clear conception being formed by anyone of what it really meant, or very much serious thought being bestowed upon it. But when the custom of granting indulgences had made its way and was adopted into the regular system of the Church, it was impossible to avoid awkward questions being raised. Explanations of its meaning were asked for, and a theological defence of it was required. This was supplied by the schoolmen, and in it "works of supererogation" play an important part.

The original system, whereby canonical penance imposed by the Church was removed by the same authority, was naturally and properly defended as the exercising of the power of "binding and loosing" which the Church possessed by Christ's own gift. But when the indulgence was something more than this, when it could be transferred to the benefit of others, and availed for the dead and mitigated the pains of purgatory, something more was needed. Even the doctrine of the union of the faithful in the one Body, together with the power of intercessory prayer, was totally inadequate to bear the superstructure of the popular system. Accordingly the schoolmen of the thirteenth century took up a phrase that had been used some time earlier, and elaborated the doctrine of the "thesaurus ecclesiae." Availing themselves of the old distinction between "counsels" and "precepts," they taught that the **voluntary works over and above God's commandments**, which had been performed by the saints, and which were not needed to "merit" their own salvation, were not lost or wasted, but went into the treasury of the Church; and that, together with the infinite merits of Christ, these **works of**

supererogation formed a deposit of superabundant good works, which the Pope, as holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, could unlock and dispense for the benefit of the faithful, so as to pay the debt of the temporal punishment of their sins, which they might still owe to God.

This was the theological defence of the system, which assumed consistency in the hands of the great schoolmen of the thirteenth century, Alexander of Hales (1245), Albertus Magnus (1280), Bonaventura (1274), and S. Thomas Aquinas (1270).¹ The language of the last, if the *Supplement* may be quoted as his, is especially instructive. It betrays a certain amount of uneasiness, and it is clear that Aquinas felt that his task was a difficult one; erroneous opinions on the subject were common, but the Church had approved of indulgences, and therefore they had to be defended.²

¹ Alexander of Hales is very strong in insisting that the indulgence avails "ad forum Dei" as well as "ad forum Ecclesiæ," and that it is more than a mere relaxation of canonical penance (*Summa*, pars iv. 9. 23, art. 1, and see art. 2). "Indulgentiæ et relaxationes fiunt de meritis supererogationis membrorum Christi, quæ sunt spiritalis thesaurus ecclesiæ. Hunc autem thesaurum non est omnium dispensare, sed tantum eorum, qui præcipue vicem Christi gerunt." "Præexistente pœna debitæ et sufficientis contritionis, potest summus pontifex totam pœnam debitam peccatori penitenti dimittere." "Probabiliter et verissime præsumitur, quod illis qui sunt in purgatorio potest pontifex facere indulgentias. Nota tamen, quod plura requiruntur ad hoc, quod debito modo fiat indulgentia: scil. potestas clavium ex parte conferentis; ex parte ejus, cui confertur, charitas, credulitas, devotio; inter utrum causa et modus—Potest ergo dici, quod illis qui sunt in purgatorio possunt fieri relaxationes secundum conditiones prædictas per modum suffragii sive impetrationis, non per modum judiciariæ absolutionis sive commutationis." These and other quotations are given in Gieseler's *Church History*, vol. iii. p. 373, where see also the teaching of Albertus Magnus, *In Sent.*, Lib. IV. dist. 20, arts. 16 and 17; and for the teaching of Aquinas see the *Summa Suppl.*, Pars iii. Q. 25–27.

² Cf. Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, vol. v. p. 60: "The starting-point of both these theologians [Bonaventura and Aquinas] was prevailing

But although a defence was thus elaborated for the system, it can hardly be seriously maintained that it can be proved from Scripture. The theory of a super-abundant "thesaurus ecclesiæ," and of good works that can thus be arbitrarily transferred from one to another, rests on a wholly false notion of our relation to God. The idea of a *quantitative* satisfaction for all things wrongly done, that has to be made either in this life or in the next, but which "is capable of being commuted for the ceremonial utterance of a prayer or the visit to a shrine, each good for a given number of days, or years, or centuries,"¹ can claim no support whatever from Scripture; the notion that men can **not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they may actually do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required,** is directly contrary to the words of our Lord, quoted in the Article: **When ye have done all that are commanded you, say, We be unprofitable servants** (S. Luke xvii. 10). Yet, as a certain scriptural foundation has been alleged for the doctrine, it is necessary to consider the passages on which the maintainers of it have relied. They are mainly two—(1) the incident of the rich young ruler, (2) the

practice. Indulgences existed, and therefore were right. It was their business to give a rational explanation of what the Church had thought fit to do." See Bonaventura, *In IV. Sent.*, dist. 20: "Universalis ecclesia has relaxationes acceptat; sed constat quod ipsa non errat, ergo vere fiunt."

¹ Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, p. 307. If it be said, as it is sometimes, it is a very difficult thing to obtain a real and valid indulgence, for that it is of no avail unless you have "made so good a confession (a very difficult thing to do) as to be free from all sin, even venial"; and unless you are "on your guard against every occasion of sin afterwards" (*Cor Cordi loquitur*, p. 233), it can only be replied, that in this case the popular system, whereby indulgences are publicly offered to those who visit certain churches, or perform certain devotions, is seriously misleading, and that the necessity for fulfilling these conditions ought to be publicly stated in every case in which an indulgence is offered.

teaching of our Lord and S. Paul on marriage and virginity.

1. The rich young ruler. The incident referred to is that related in S. Matt. xix. 16-22. It is argued by Bellarmine, who adduces it, that as the young man had "kept the commandments," he had done all that was necessary to obtain eternal life, and that therefore the words, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven," contain not a "precept," but a "counsel"; and thus, if the direction had been followed, a "work of supererogation" would have been performed. To this it has been fairly replied that since the charge was given in answer to the question, "What *lack* I yet?" it is obvious that something was still wanting, and that there is no room for the notion of works of supererogation here. It is clear from the young man's previous answer that he had formed a very inadequate conception of his duty to God, and of the real range of the claim which God had upon him. It was in order to help him to realise this that the further direction was given, and the conclusion of the narrative shows that there was indeed something "lacking" to him, for "when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions."

2. The teaching of S. Paul on virginity in 1 Cor. vii. has been already referred to, with its implied distinction between "precepts" and "counsels." Our Lord's words, in which He speaks of some who have "made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake" (S. Matt. xix. 12), are also referred to in this connection; and it is inferred that those who follow the "counsel" lay up a superabundant store of good works which can "satisfy" for others, as they are not needed

for those who perform them. Now it may be freely admitted that a distinction may be rightly drawn between "precepts" and "counsels." There are some things which are duties for *all* alike, which are commanded to all men generally, and can therefore be put in the form of universal "precepts." There are other things to which all men are clearly not called. It is obvious on the face of it that there can be no "precept" to abstain from marriage, or the obedience of men would bring the world to an end. And yet there are those to whom the words of Holy Scripture on the virgin state, or the command to "sell all thou hast," come with an imperative voice; and they feel constrained to obey. To *them* the counsel has become a precept. By obeying they perform no "works of supererogation," but are simply following the Divine voice, which tells their conscience that the charge is for *them*. By rejecting it, they may imperil their salvation, for our Lord Himself says, when speaking on this very subject: "He that is able to receive it, *let him receive it*" (S. Matt. xix. 12).¹

If, then, the admission of a distinction between precepts and counsels does not involve the theory of works of supererogation, the whole scriptural foundation for them breaks down, and we may reasonably conclude that they **cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety**, and that they are opposed to our Lord's words already referred to: "When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do."

¹ "It is a further question whether a person's salvation may not be very seriously involved in *his* obeying a call from God, even although that to which he is called may not be in itself necessary to salvation."
—Pusey, *The Truth of the Office of the English Church*, p. 215.

ARTICLE XV

*Nemo præter Christum est sine
peccato.*

Christus in nostræ naturæ veritate per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne tum in spiritu. Venit, ut Agnus absque macula esset, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam tolleret: et peccatum (ut inquit Johannes) in eo non erat. Sed nos reliqui, etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes: et si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

*Of Christ alone without
Sin.*

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, Who, by the sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world: and sin (as S. John saith) was not in Him. But all we the rest (although baptized, and born again in Christ), yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

THIS Article dates from 1553, since which time it has undergone no alteration. Its language has not been traced to any earlier source. Three principal subjects are treated of in it, viz.—

1. Christ's perfect humanity and sinlessness.
2. His atonement.
3. Our sinfulness.

Since all these subjects have been previously considered in the Articles (1 and 2 in Article II., and 3 in Articles IX. and X.), it is not altogether easy to see the exact object with which the one before us was added to the series. Hardwick¹ and Bishop Harold

¹ Pp. 100, 402.

Browne¹ both appear to hold that it was aimed against the belief in the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. This does not, however, appear probable for the following reasons :—

1. The Blessed Virgin is not mentioned in the Article. As a rule the Articles are perfectly direct and plain spoken in their condemnation of erroneous views, and if their compilers had had this doctrine in view it is most unlikely that they would have contented themselves with so *indirect* a condemnation of it.

2. Much of the Article is on this hypothesis unnecessary. Why was it needful to say so much about Christ's perfect humanity and atonement in order to condemn the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception?

3. The expression in the Article is, "all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ," etc., and it would be perfectly open to a Romanist to hold that the Blessed Virgin was never baptized, and that, *therefore*, her case is not considered in the Article at all!²

4. At the time when the Articles were drawn up there was no need to condemn the doctrine, as it was not held *de fide* in the Roman Church.³

A far more probable view is that this Article (like the following one) was aimed against the errors of some

¹ *Articles*, p. 347.

² This is actually the view taken by Francis a Sancta Clara (Davenport), a Franciscan, who wrote a Commentary on the Articles in 1633, endeavouring to reconcile them with the Tridentine decrees. See his *Paraphrastica Expositio*, p. 20.

³ The doctrine was first *definitely* discussed by the schoolmen, the Franciscans upholding it, the Dominicans (including Aquinas) denying it (see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii. p. 260). The Council of Trent managed to remain neutral and to avoid a condemnation of either party, merely stating that it was not intended to include the Blessed Virgin in the decree on original sin (Session V.). It was reserved for Pope Pius ix. to declare the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to be an article of faith by his Bull of December 9, 1854.

among the Anabaptists. On this hypothesis every word in it tells, for among these fanatics were some who revived docetic notions of our Lord's humanity, some who denied His atonement and asserted His sinfulness, and others who had the hardihood to maintain that the regenerate could not sin. Nowhere do we find a clearer statement of their errors, or a better commentary on this and the following Article, than in the letter of Bishop Hooper, which has been already quoted in the first volume of this work.¹ Similarly, in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* we meet with a condemnation of the very same errors.² And in the light of these passages we may safely conclude that the real object of the Article was to condemn in plain and direct terms the heresies of those who denied our Lord's true humanity, sinlessness, and atonement, while maintaining their own entire freedom from sin.

Since the doctrines of our Lord's human nature and of His atonement were considered under Article II., and that of human depravity came before us in connection

¹ See vol. i. p. 22.

² *De Hæres.* cap. 5. "De duabus naturis Christi. . . . Alii eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cœlo divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per Canalem aut fistulam præterfluxerit.

"Cap. 8. De perfectione justificatorum, et de operibus supererogationis. Illorum etiam superbia legibus nostris est frangenda, qui tantam vitæ perfectionem hominibus justificatis attribuunt, quantam nec imbecillitas nostræ naturæ fert, nec quisquam sibi præter Christum sumere potest; nimirum ut omnis peccati sint expertes, si mentem ad recte pieque vivendum instituerint. Et hanc volunt absolutam morum perfectionem in hanc præsentem vitam cadere, cum debilis ipsa sit, et fragilis, et ad omnes virtutis et officii ruinas præceps, etc.

"Cap. 9. De casu justificatorum et peccato in Spiritum Sanctum. Etiam illi de justificatis perverse sentiunt, qui credunt illos, postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere, aut si forte quicquam eorum faciunt, quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere."

with Article IX., and will require to be noticed under Article XVI., it is unnecessary to say more upon them here. The only point touched on in this Article on which nothing has so far been said directly, is that of our Lord's sinlessness. On this matter the evidence of Scripture is clear and precise. (*a*) Not only is there no hint or indication of sin in any word or action attributed to Him, but His challenge to the Jews, "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?" (S. John viii. 46), and His declaration on the eve of His Passion, "the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me" (S. John xiv. 30), are clearly the utterances of one who was absolutely free from all taint of sin.¹ (*b*) Reference should also be made to the definite statements of the apostles. S. Peter, S. Paul, S. John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews all agree in directly asserting His sinlessness.

"Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth," 1 Pet. ii. 22. "Him who knew no sin, He made to be sin on our behalf," 2 Cor. v. 21.² "He was manifested to take away sins, and in Him is no sin," 1 John iii. 5. "One that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," Heb. iv. 15. "Such an high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for this He did once for all, when He offered up Himself," Heb. vii. 26, 27.

Such passages as these are amply sufficient to justify

¹ Cf. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 23.

² Cf. Rom. viii. 3: *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*. "The flesh of Christ is 'like' ours inasmuch as it is flesh: 'like,' and only 'like,' because it is not sinful: *Ostendit nos quidem habere carnem peccati, Filium vero Dei similitudinem habuisse carnis peccati* (Orig.-lat.)." —Sanday and Headlam *in loc*.

the statement of the Article that **Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly¹ void, both in His flesh and in His spirit . . . and sin (as S. John saith) was not in Him.**²

¹ Lat. *prorsus*. Clearly = thoroughly, completely, unreservedly. It is so used in *Piers the Plowman*, "Thei shul be clenسد *clereliche* and wasshen of her sinnes in my prisoun purgatorie" (B. xviii. 389), and later in Fitzherbert's 'Surveyinge' (A.D. 1525): "Letto a man make a castell, towre, or any maner of newe buildings and finyssh it *clerely*." Other instances of a similar use of the word are given in Murray's *New English Dictionary*, s.v.

² On the subject of our Lord's absolute sinlessness (the "non posse peccare" as well as "posse non peccare"), and its compatibility with liability to real temptation, see an article on "Our Lord's Human Example" in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xvi. p. 282; Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 165; Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, Appendix; Mill's *Sermons on the Temptation*, p. 24; and R. L. Ottley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation* vol. ii. p. 293.

ARTICLE XVI

De peccato post Baptismum.

Non omne peccatum mortale post baptismum voluntarie perpetratum, est peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum et irremissibile. Proinde lapsis a baptismo in peccata locus pœnitentiæ non est negandus. Post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum possumus a gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuoque per gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideoque illi damnandi sunt qui se quamdiu hic vivant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere resipiscentibus veniæ locum denegant.

Of Sin after Baptism.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

THE title of this Article in the first edition of 1553 was *De peccato in Spiritum Sanctum* ("Of Sin against the Holy Ghost"). This was altered in 1563 into *De lapsis post Baptismum* ("Of Sin after Baptism"); and at the final revision of 1571 the Latin was made to correspond more closely with the English by the substitution of the present phrase, "*De peccato post Baptismum.*" In two other expressions in the body of the Article slight changes have also been made. "*Locus pœnitentiæ*" was in 1553 translated in the English version by "place for penitentes," and "place for penitence" in 1563; "grant of repentance" being inserted in 1571; at which time "*locus veniæ*" in the last sentence was substituted for "*locus pœnitentiæ.*"

(In 1553 this had been rendered, as at its first occurrence in the Article, "place for penitentes," for which "place of forgiveness" had been inserted in 1563.)

There is a general resemblance between this Article and the twelfth of the Confession of Augsburg, but the verbal similarity is not sufficiently close to justify us in saying that the last-mentioned document was the source of our own Article.¹ The two are aimed against the same errors, which consisted in a revival of the views of some in early days concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, the impossibility of falling from grace, and the refusal of pardon to those who fall into deadly sin after baptism. These errors are also noticed in the letter of Bishop Hooper, referred to in the last Article. "A man, they say, who is thus regenerate cannot sin. They add that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin";² and further evidence of their existence at the time when the Article was drawn up may be found in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*,³ as well as in the following passage from Calvin's *Institutes*.

¹ "De pœnitentia. De pœnitentia docent quod lapsis post baptismum contingere possit remissio peccatorum, quocunque tempore cum convertuntur. Et quod ecclesia talibus redeuntibus ad pœnitentiam absolutionem impertiri debeat. Constat autem pœnitentia proprie his duabus partibus: altera est contritio seu terrores incussi conscientie agnito peccato. Altera est fides, quæ concipitur ex evangelio seu absolutione, et credit propter Christum remitti peccata, et consolatur conscientiam et ex terroribus liberat. Deinde sequi debent bona opera, quæ sunt fructus pœnitentiæ. Damnant Anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum. Item, qui contendunt quibusdam tantam perfectionem in hac vita contingere ut peccare non possint. Damnantur et Novatiani qui volebant absolvere lapsos post baptismum redeuntes ad pœnitentiam. Rejiciuntur et isti qui non docent remissionem peccatorum per fidem contingere, sed jubent nos mereri gratiam per satisfactiones nostras."

² See vol. i. p. 22.

³ *Ref. Leg. Eccl.*, De Hæres. cap. 9: "Etiam illi de justificatis perverse

"Our age also has some of the Anabaptists not very unlike the Novatians. For they pretend that the people of God are regenerated in baptism into a pure and angelical life. . . . But if any man fail after baptism, they leave nothing to him but the inexorable judgment of God." ¹

Two main subjects appear to require consideration in this Article.

1. The fact that deadly sin is not unpardonable.
2. The possibility of falling from grace.

I. *The fact that deadly Sin is not Unpardonable.*

(a) Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.

The view of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost which is here rejected, appears to have been first propounded by Origen in the third century,² and was revived in the sixteenth by some among the Anabaptists. A brief examination of the passages of the New Testament which speak of the sin which "hath never forgiveness" will

sentiant, qui credunt illos postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere, aut si forte quicquam eorum faciunt, quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere. Quibus opinione contrarii, sed impietate pares sunt, qui quodecunque peccatum mortale, quod post baptismum a nobis susceptum voluntate nostra committitur, illud omne contra Spiritum Sanctum affirmant gestum esse et remitti non posse."

¹ *Institutes*, IV. i. 23.

² See Athanasius, *Ep. ad. Scrap.* iv. § 10, where this view (which he also attributes to Theognostus) is considered and rejected. The view of Athanasius himself appears to be that whereas "blasphemy against the Son of Man" was to blaspheme against Him before the full revelation of His Divinity was made, "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" is to "ascribe the deeds of the Word to the devil," *i.e.* to blaspheme against Him after His eternal Godhead has been manifested. Cf. *Orationes contra Arianos*, I. § 50.

show that whatever may be the precise nature of the irremissible sin, there is certainly no ground for maintaining that all deadly sin willingly committed after baptism should be regarded as unpardonable.

The passages to be considered fall into two groups : (1) those in the Gospel in which our Lord speaks of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost ; (2) certain passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of S. John.

1. In regard to the first class of passages (S. Matt. xii. 31-37 ; S. Mark iii. 28-30 ; S. Luke xii. 10), it must be noticed that our Lord never speaks in general terms of "sin against the Holy Ghost" as unpardonable. Of *one* sin, which He terms "the blasphemy against the Spirit," He says, "it shall not be forgiven," and that the man who commits it "is guilty of an eternal sin" (*ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος*).¹ Now the fact that this sin is thus spoken of as "blasphemy" at once marks it out as a sin of a particular class, belonging to sins of the tongue, involving outward expression ; while the occasion on which our Lord warned His hearers against it ("because they said He had an unclean spirit") throws light on its character. Whether the Pharisees had been actually guilty of it our Lord does not say, but they were clearly in danger of committing it ; and what they were doing was to ascribe manifestly Divine works to Satanic agency. To do this was in a very real sense to "blaspheme against the Holy Spirit," by whose agency the works were done. And it is quite clear that, whatever be the precise nature of the irre-

¹ That this is the true reading in S. Mark iii. 30 is undoubted. The *textus receptus* has *κρίσεως* for *ἁμαρτήματος*. The amended reading has an important bearing on the question of the justice of eternal punishment. If the punishment is "eternal," is it not because the sin is "eternal" ?

missible sin of which our Lord speaks,¹ no support whatever can be drawn from His words for the general proposition that deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is unpardonable. It may be noted in passing that the Edwardian Articles did not content themselves, as our own do, with simply denying an erroneous view of the nature of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, but proceeded in an additional Article (XVI.) to define its nature more precisely. The Article ran as follows:—

Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

“Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is, when a man, of malice and stubbornness of mind, doth rail upon the truth of God’s word manifestly perceived, and being enemy thereunto persecuteth the same. And because such be guilty of God’s curse, they entangle themselves with a most grievous and heinous crime, whereupon this kind of sin is called and affirmed of the Lord unpardonable.”

The Article was omitted by Parker in the revision of 1563, probably from an unwillingness to define the nature of this sin, and a desire not to bind the consciences of the clergy to a particular interpretation of a difficult set of passages. And as our present Articles are contented with a purely *negative* position, denying an erroneous view, but stating nothing positively concerning the character of this “blasphemy,” there is no need to enter further upon the subject here. Reference may, however, be made in passing to Waterland’s able and convincing sermon upon S. Matt. xii. 31, 32, where

¹ Bishop Ellicott (*Lectures on the Life of our Lord*, p. 187, note 1) defines it as “an outward expression of an inward hatred of that which is recognised and felt to be Divine,” and truly says that its irremissible nature depends, “not on the refusal of grace, but on the now lost ability of fulfilling the conditions required for forgiveness.”

the reader will find a full discussion of "the precise nature of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost."¹

2. There remain for consideration certain hard passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of S. John, on which Origen and Theognostus based their views, and which also played an important part in the controversies of the early Church concerning penitential discipline and the restoration of the lapsed to communion, since it was urged by the advocates of strictness that it was contrary to the teaching of these Epistles for the Church to grant reconciliation and pardon to those who had fallen into deadly sin after baptism.² The passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews are three in number: chs. vi. 4-6, x. 26-29, xii. 15-17.

Ch. vi. 4-6: "For as touching those who were once enlightened (ἄπαξ φωτισθέντας) and tasted (γευσάμενους) of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away (παραπεσόντας), it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh (or, "the while they crucify," etc., R.V. marg. ἀνασταυροῦντας), and put Him to an open shame (παραδευματίζοντας)."

With regard to this passage it is very important to

¹ Waterland, *Works*, vol. v. Sermon xxviii. See also Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Bk. V. vol. ii. p. 475 (Eng. tr.).

² It has not been thought necessary to give in the text any account of these controversies, the principal of which were those with the Montanists and Novatianists and (in later times) the Donatists. The Montanists taught the impossibility of a second repentance, and refused to restore to communion those who had been guilty of deadly sin. The Novatianists appear to have admitted the possibility of final pardon for such sinners (and possibly the Montanists did not actually deny this), but they denied to the Church the power to grant peace and reconciliation to them. For some account of these controversies, see Schaff's *History of the Church*, "Ante-Nicene Christianity," pp. 196 and 425.

notice the exact words used by the apostolic writer. Those of whom he is speaking (whether or no φωτισθέντας be taken definitely of baptism¹) had been thoroughly Christianised, and had subsequently apostatised ("and then fell they"). They are regarded as still opposing themselves to Christianity, still "crucifying the Son of God afresh," and "putting Him to an open shame" (notice the *present* participles here); and while they are doing this it is impossible, says the writer, to renew them again to repentance. But nothing whatever is said of an "impossibility" should they cease their opposition to the gospel. Hence, as Bishop Westcott has pointed out, "the apostasy described is marked, not only by a decisive act, but also by a continuous present attitude, a hostile relation to Christ Himself and to belief in Christ; and thus there is no question of the abstract efficacy of the means of grace provided through the ordinances of the Church. The state of the men themselves is such as to preclude their application."²

Ch. x. 26-29: "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much surer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

¹ "Φωτίζειν and φωτισμός were commonly applied to baptism from the time of Justin (*Apol.* i. 61, 65; cf. *Dial.* c. 122) downwards. And the Syrian versions give this sense here."—Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 148.

² *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, additional note on vi. 1-8, p. 165.

Here again it will be sufficient to note that the tense is *present*. "It must be observed that the sacrifice of Christ is finally rejected, and sin persisted in (*ἀμαρτανόντων*). The writer does not set limits to the efficacy of Christ's work for the penitent."¹

Ch. xii. 15-17: "Looking carefully lest there be any man that falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of meat sold his own birthright. For ye know that even when he afterward desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected (for he found no place of repentance), though he sought it diligently with tears."

It will be observed that the difficulty of this passage is far less when rendered (as above) as it is in the Revised Version. Readers of the Authorised Version might naturally think that the writer denied that Esau found repentance, or a place of repentance. A reference to the Greek makes it clear that what Esau sought was not a "place of repentance" (*τόπον μετανοίας*), for the pronoun "it" is feminine (*αὐτήν*). Grammatically it may refer either to "repentance" (*μετανοίας*) or to "the blessing" (*εὐλογίαν*); but there can be little room for doubt that the Revisers are right in referring it to the latter (cf. Gen. xxvii. 38). If this is so there is no ground for maintaining, on the strength of this passage, that a man may seek diligently to find repentance and fail to obtain it. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that when Esau "sought the blessing diligently with tears," his probation, so far as his birthright was concerned, was already over, for the award had been made, and the blessing actually given to another. His "repentance," therefore, is parallel to nothing on this side of the

¹ Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 327.

grave. Thus, while all these passages are full of solemn warning on the terrible consequences of sin, and the danger of putting off repentance too late, it will be seen that when carefully considered they give no countenance to the opinion which is condemned in the Article as to the irremissible character of deadly sin willingly committed after baptism.

The same is true of the remaining passage in the First Epistle of S. John (1 John v. 16, 17): "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say that he should make request. All unrighteousness is sin: there is a sin not unto death."

On this passage is based the distinction ordinarily drawn in the Church between "deadly" and "venial" sins. It will be noticed, however, that S. John does not define "sin unto death," nor, indeed, does he absolutely forbid intercession for it. He is dealing, as Bishop Westcott points out, with the prayers of Christians for Christians; and after pointing out the efficacy of their prayers for one another, he indicates that there is a sin, the natural issue of which is death (*πρὸς θάνατον*). This excludes men from the Christian society, and he cannot enjoin prayer for it.¹ But there is no reason whatever for maintaining that the Apostle denies the possibility of forgiveness for such deadly sin, if the sin is forsaken and repented of.

(b) **Wherefore the grant of repentance** (*locus penitentiae*) **is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism.** The statement of the Article would seem to follow naturally from the position just maintained. And it may be supported by a refer-

¹ See Bishop Westcott's "additional note" in *The Epistles of S. John*, p. 199.

ence to S. Paul's treatment of the incestuous man at Corinth. Here was a man who had been guilty of a most deadly sin, and who had been by the Apostle's direction excluded from the fellowship of the faithful, and "delivered unto Satan" (1 Cor. v. 4, 5). But this "deliverance unto Satan" did not necessarily involve his final condemnation. On the contrary, its object is described as "the destruction of the flesh, *that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.*" Moreover, if 2 Cor. ii. 5-11 refers (as is commonly thought) to the same case, then the Apostle distinctly contemplates the restoration of the offender upon his repentance to the communion of the Church, and charges the Corinthians to forgive him and reinstate him. And if for such a sinner a "locus pœnitentiæ" was allowed, it is difficult to think that in other cases the Church would be right in refusing it. Consequently the Church has always resisted the demands made by some in the interests of purity that those who have fallen into a grievous sin should be excluded from communion for the remainder of their lives, and has never shrunk from proclaiming God's forgiveness to *all* penitent sinners. In some of the early controversies in regard to penitential discipline a distinction was drawn between these two things, namely, God's willingness finally to forgive those who have been guilty of deadly sin after baptism, and the power of the Church to grant "pardon" to such. It was sometimes urged, as by the Novatianists,¹ that though God might in His

¹ That this was the position maintained by Novatian seems to be shown by the words of S. Cyprian in *Ep.* lv. § 28 (*al.* li.), where he describes him as urging the lapsed to weep and mourn, and do all that is necessary for peace, though "peace" was refused them. Eusebius speaks as if all hope of salvation was denied to them (*H. E.* VI. xliii.). In this, however, he was probably mistaken as regards Novatian and his followers, though the statement would perhaps be true of the Montanists. See Tertullian, *De*

infinite mercy forgive such at the last, yet the Church had no commission from Him to declare His forgiveness, and therefore could hold out no "locus pœnitentiæ" to the lapsed, although she might urge them to pray that they might finally receive pardon, and find a "place of forgiveness" (locus veniæ). It would appear that this distinction was present to the Elizabethan revisers of the Articles (if not to their original compilers), for after saying that "the grant of repentance (locus pœnitentiæ) is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism," the Article adds at the close the statement that

(c) They are to be condemned which . . . deny the place of forgiveness (locus veniæ) to such as truly repent.—That some distinction of meaning between the two phrases locus pœnitentiæ and locus veniæ (and their English equivalents) is intended, is shown by the fact already noted, that originally the same phrase stood in both clauses of the Article.¹ The diversity of phraseology subsequently introduced must have had some definite intention, and it was in all probability that which has just been indicated. Thus the Article as a whole implies, not only that God is willing to forgive penitent sinners, but, further, that the Church has a commission to declare His pardon, and to grant reconciliation where there is true repentance.

The phrase "locus pœnitentiæ" is almost a technical *Pudicitia*, c. xix., where he says that there are some sins which admit of no pardon, namely, murder, idolatry, fraud, denial of Christ, blasphemy, adultery, and fornication. "For these Christ will no longer plead" (*Horum ultra exorator non erit Christus*). He says, however, in the same chapter, of a grievous sinner: "Let her indeed repent, but in order to put an end to her adultery, not, however, in prospect of restoration to communion. For this will be a repentance (pœnitentia) which we too acknowledge to be due much more than you do; but concerning pardon (*venia*), we reserve it to God."

¹ See above, p. 444.

one for an opportunity of changing a former decision, so that the consequences no longer follow. It occurs in Latin writers, *e.g.* 4 Esdr. ix. 12, as well as the Jurists¹ and others, being used in Pliny's famous letter to Trajan on the Christians, where he expresses a hope of their improvement if a "locus pœnitentiæ" is granted to them.² The Greek equivalent, τόπος μετανοίας, is also found in Wisd. xii. 10, as well as in early Christian writers,³ by whom it was probably taken from Heb. xii. 17, where the Vulgate renders it by "locus pœnitentiæ." "Locus veniæ" does not seem to be of such frequent occurrence. It is used, however, by Tertullian in *De Pudicitia*, c. xviii.

II. *The Possibility of Falling from Grace.*

On this subject the teaching of the Article is clear and decided. **After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here.** These statements are primarily aimed against the teaching of the Anabaptists, who maintained that a man who is regenerate cannot sin. Such teaching is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. The Lord's Prayer, which was surely meant to be a prayer to be used by *all* men, recognises the need of forgiveness for all; and the language of the Apostles addressed to believers throughout the Epistles assumes that all have sinned and come

¹ Bishop Westcott (on Heb. xii. 17) quotes Ulpian, *ap. Corp. J. C.*, Dig. XL. tit. vii. 3, § 13.

² Pliny, *Epp.* x. 97.

³ *E.g.* Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* I. vii.; Tatian, *c. Græc.* xv.; *Const. Apost.* II. xxxviii., V. xix.

short of the glory of God. There are, however, some words in the First Epistle of S. John to which the Anabaptists and others who maintained a theory of perfection could point in support of the statement that the regenerate cannot sin, namely, 1 John iii. 6, 9: "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither knoweth Him. . . . Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because His seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God" (cf. also c. v. 18: "Whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not"). Strong as these words are, it must be remembered that the writer who uses them has already in an earlier passage of the same Epistle said emphatically: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; but if we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us." These words are perfectly general, and seem quite incompatible with the notion that S. John teaches that any man can claim total immunity from sin and the possibility of sinning here on earth. How, then, is the later passage, previously cited, to be understood? It must certainly be qualified by what has already been said by the writer, and therefore we need feel no hesitation in pressing the present tenses, *οὐκ ἁμαρτάνει, ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν*, and saying that they refer to a habit and practice rather than to isolated acts. It is true that the believer often falls into sin, yet sin is not the ruling principle of his life, and in so far as he is really born of God and abides in Him, "he sinneth not." If it be urged that thus to interpret the words is to explain away the language of Scripture, it may fairly be replied that "the only possible escape from such modification is

by asserting the possibility of sinlessness, *which contradicts* i. 8, or else by asserting that *none* of us have seen God, and none of us are children of God, *which contradicts the whole Epistle*";¹ and as there are no other passages of Scripture which give any countenance to the theory of sinless perfection in this life, the Article is perfectly justified in its assertions, that "after we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin," and that "they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin so long as they live here."

It will be noticed that after laying down that we may depart from grace, the Article says further, "We may arise again and amend our lives." It is important to notice that the word is *may*, not *must*, for herein lies a marked difference between the teaching of the Church of England and the Calvinistic tenet of "indefectible grace"; for Calvin and his followers, while rejecting the Anabaptist notion that the "regenerate" cannot sin, nevertheless taught that those who were once made Christ's own, though they might fall away for a time, could not permanently and finally lose His grace.² Thus the statement of our Article has always been a stumbling-block to them. So early as 1572 the authors of the Second

¹ Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 434. See also Westcott, *Epistles of S. John*, p. 101. "*Sinneth not*. The commentary on this phrase is found in ch. i. 6. It describes a character, 'a prevailing habit,' and not primarily an act. Each separate sinful act does as such interrupt the fellowship; and yet so far as it is foreign to the character of the man, and removed from him (ii. 1), it leaves his character unchanged." Reference may also be made to Dr. Plummer's note in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, p. 124.

² See the fifth and sixth of the "Lambeth Articles." "A true, living, and justifying faith—the Spirit of God sanctifying—is not extinguished, does not fall away, does not vanish in the elect either totally or finally." "A truly faithful man, that is, one endowed with justifying faith, is certain by the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and his eternal salvation through Christ."

Admonition to Parliament were forced to admit that "the book of the articles of Christian religion speaketh very dangerously of falling from grace, which is to be reformed because it savoureth too much of error." And at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 a suggestion was made that after the statement that we "may depart from grace given," there should be added the qualifying words, "yet neither totally nor finally."¹ Happily no notice was taken of these criticisms, and the sober statement of the Article remained unqualified. The whole tenor of Scripture implies the possibility of falling from grace; and if S. Paul had reason to fear lest, when he had preached to others, he himself "should be rejected" or "become reprobate" (*ἀδόκιμος*), 1 Cor. ix. 27, it is hard to understand how men can be found to deny the same possibility in the case of others. The subject is closely connected with the whole doctrine of Predestination, and will therefore come before us again in connection with the Seventeenth Article, where something will be said on the Calvinistic system in general. It is therefore unnecessary to consider the matter more fully here.

¹ See vol. i. p. 53 *seq.*

ARTICLE XVII

De Prædestinatione et Electione.

Prædestinatio ad vitam, est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque ut vasa in honorem efficta, per Christum ad æternam salutem adducere: Unde qui tam præclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur: vocationi per gratiam parent: justificantur gratis: adoptantur in filios: unigeniti Jesu Christi imaginem efficiuntur conformes: in bonis operibus sancte ambulant: et demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem.

Quemadmodum Prædestinationis et Electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis suavis et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis et his qui sentiunt in se vim Spiritus Christi, facta carnis et membra quæ adhuc sunt super terram mortificantem, animumque ad celestia et superna rapientem, tum quia fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit: ita homini-

Of Predestination and Election.

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and con-

bus curiosis, carnalibus, et Spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari Prædestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos Diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in æque perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem.

Deinde promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositæ sunt: et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus diserte revelatam.

firm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and in our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

THE changes which this Article has undergone since 1553 are very slight; the words "in Christ" were added in the first paragraph in 1563, and at the same time "although the decrees of Predestination are unknown to us" were omitted at the commencement of paragraph the third.

The *object* of the Article was evidently to allay the angry strifes on the subject of predestination, and while speaking in cautious terms on what was felt to be a deep mystery, to guard against the excesses and extravagances to which the doctrine had led. Thus, after describing what predestination is in the first paragraph, the whole of the rest of the Article is devoted to the *practical* consequences which follow from the doctrine, and to laying down rules which, when rightly understood, are distinctly aimed against that limitation of God's love and God's promises, which has been characteristic of so much predestinarian teaching. The need for such an Article as this is pointedly shown in the language of the section

“De Prædestinatione” in the *Reformatio Legum*, which begins by calling attention to the terrible consequences, shown in the lives of many, springing from what can only be called a reckless and monstrous fatalism. The section is one which deserves careful study, and will be seen to throw not a little light on the meaning of the Article now under consideration.

“Ad extremum in Ecclesia multi feris et dissolutis moribus vivunt, qui cum re ipsa curiosi sint, differti luxu, et a Christi spiritu prorsus alieni, semper prædestinationem et rejectionem, vel, ut usitate loquuntur, reprobationem in sermone jactant, ut cum æterno consilio Deus vel de salute vel de interitu aliquid certi constituerit, inde latebram suis maleficiis et sceleribus, et omnis generis perversitati quærant. Et cum pastores dissipatam illorum et flagitiosam vitam coarguunt, in voluntatem Dei criminum suorum culpam conferunt, et hac defensione profligatas admonitorum reprehensiones existimant: ac ita tandem, duce diabolo, vel in desperationis puteum abjiciuntur præcipites, vel ad solutam quandam et mollem vitæ securitatem, sine aut pœnitentia aut scelerum conscientia dilabuntur. Quæ duo mala disparem naturam, sed finem videntur eundem habere. Nos vero sacris Scripturis eruditi, talem in hac re doctrinam ponimus, quod diligens et accurata cogitatio de prædestinatione nostra et electione suscepta (de quibus Dei voluntate determinatum fuit antequam mundi fundamenta jacerentur); hæc itaque diligens et seria, quam diximus, his de rebus cogitatio, piorum hominum animos Spiritu Christi afflatos, et carnis et membrorum subjectionem persentiscentes, et ad cœlestia sursum tendentes, dulcissima quadam et jucundissima consolatione permulcet, quoniam fidem nostram de perpetua salute per Christum ad nos perventura confirmat, vehementissimas charitatis in Deum flammæ accendit, mirabiliter ad gratias

agendas exsuscitat, ad bona nos opera propinquissime adducit, et a peccatis longissime abducit, quoniam a Deo sumus electi, et filii ejus instituti. Quæ singularis et eximia conditio summam a nobis salubritatem morum, et excellentissimam virtutis perfectionem requirit: denique nobis arrogantiam minuit, ne viribus nostris geri credamus, quæ gratuita Dei beneficentia et infinita bonitate indulgentur. Præterea neminem ex hoc loco purgationem censemus vitiorum suorum afferre posse; quia Deus nihil ulla in re injuste constituit, nec ad peccata voluntates nostras unquam invitas trudit. Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt, ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta prædestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitæ suæ rationem ad Dei leges accommodent; cum et promissiones bonis et minas malis, in sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplantur. Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illa Dei voluntate commorari, quam in sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus.”¹

This section, it will be noticed, guards still more strongly than does the Article against the abuses of the doctrine, and points out very precisely the dangers then existing. It is also valuable as indicating with certainty the true interpretation of the last clause of the Article, which says that God’s promises are to be received “in such wise as they be *generally* set forth to us in Holy Scripture,”—a subject on which something must be said later on.

The sources of the Article, and of the section just quoted from the *Reformatio Legum*, are thought to lie to some extent in the writings of Luther, including both his letters and the Preface to the Epistle to the Romans;²

¹ *Reformatio Legum Eccl.*, *De Hæres.* c. xxii.

² See Bp. Short’s *History of the Church of England*, c. x. App. C, where this is pointed out; and see below, p. 485.

and the language of the last paragraph has been traced by Archbishop Laurence to Melancthon.¹ Still more important, however, is it to notice that the description of predestination given in the first paragraph is to a very great extent couched *in the actual words of Holy Scripture*. The chief passages on which it is based are Rom. viii. and ix. and Eph. i., and the correspondence is even closer in the Latin than in the English. In writing to the Ephesians S. Paul blesses God, "who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ: even as *He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world* (sicut elegit nos in ipso ante mundi constitutionem), that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love: *having foreordained us unto adoption as sons*, through Jesus Christ unto Himself, *according to the good pleasure of His will* (qui prædestinavit nos in adoptionem filiorum per Jesum Christum in ipsum secundum propositum voluntatis suæ), to the praise of the glory of His grace, which He freely bestowed on us in the Beloved . . . in whom also we were made a heritage, *having been foreordained according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will* (prædestinati secundum propositum ejus, qui operatur omnia secundum consilium voluntatis suæ)," Eph. i. 3-11. Elsewhere he speaks of "vessels made to honour" (cf. "*vasa in honorem efficta*" with "*an non habet potestatem figulus luti ex eadem massa facere aliud quidem vas in honorem, aliud in contumeliam?*" Rom. ix. 21), while in Rom. viii. 28-30, he tells us that "to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are *called according to His purpose*. For whom He foreknew, He also *foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son*, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren: and *whom He fore-*

¹ See Archbp. Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 179.

ordained, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified" (Scimus autem quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia co-operantur in bonum, iis qui secundum propositum vocati sunt sancti: Nam quos præscivit, et prædestinavit conformes fieri imaginis Filii sui, ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus. Quos autem prædestinavit, hos et vocavit, et quos vocavit, hos et justificavit; quos autem justificavit, illos et glorificavit). If these passages are carefully compared with the Article, it will easily be seen how closely it follows them: and hence it results that to one who has previously accepted Scripture as containing the word of God, the positive statements of the Article present no further difficulty.¹ They are evidently meant to be simply a reflection of the language of Scripture, and therefore whatever interpretation we are justified in putting upon the language of Scripture, the same we shall be justified in putting upon the corresponding language of the Article. This principle, when fully grasped, will be found to remove much of the difficulty which is sometimes felt in regard to subscription to this Seventeenth Article. It is only in the first and last paragraphs that any difficulty is found. The second paragraph, dealing with the practical consequences of the doctrine, contains nothing to which exception can be taken. The third paragraph will be explained and justified later on; and if this first paragraph be taken, as it is surely meant to be taken, as a summary of Scripture statements rather than a definite interpretation of them, no difficulty whatever need be felt as to its acceptance. Coming now to the substance of the Article, the subjects treated of in it are the following:—

¹ Cf. the passage from Mozley's *Lectures and other Theological Papers* (p. 220), quoted in vol. i. p. 352.

1. The description of predestination.
2. The steps which accompany it.
3. The practical effect of the doctrine.
4. Two considerations calculated to guard the doctrine from abuses.

I. *The Description of Predestination.*

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour.

There have been from time to time various theories held with regard to predestination, and various schemes and systems have been formed by Christians. Of these, the most important are the following, which it will be convenient to consider in the order in which they are here enumerated, rather than in accordance with a more strictly chronological arrangement:—

(a) Ecclesiastical predestination.

(b) The Arminian theory.

(c) The Calvinistic theory.

(d) The Augustinian theory.

(a) *Ecclesiastical Predestination.*—According to this, predestination is not necessarily to life, but to privilege, *i.e.* to the opportunity of obtaining eternal life in the way of God's covenant. On this view, the "elect" are to be identified with the "called," and include all baptized persons. As Bishop Harold Browne puts it: "Some have held that as the Jews of old were God's chosen people, so now is the Christian Church; that

every baptized member of the Church is one of God's elect, and that this election is from God's irrespective and unsearchable decree. Here, therefore, *election* is to be *baptismal privileges*, not to final glory; the elect are identical with the *baptized*, and the election constitutes *the Church*."¹

That this doctrine is taught in Holy Scripture admits of no doubt whatever. Throughout the Old Testament God is said to have "chosen" the whole people of the Jews, and not a select few out of their number.² The "children of Jacob" were His "chosen ones" or "elect" (Ps. cv. 6).³ And when we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we find that the members of the Christian Church are regarded as having succeeded to the privileges of the Jews, and that the language used of the Israelites is applied by the Apostles to them.⁴ So S. Paul, in writing to different Churches, addresses his readers indiscriminately as "called" (*κλητοί*);⁵ and S. Peter in a similar way writes to the "elect" (*ἐκλεκτοί*) who are "sojourners of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia,

¹ *On the Articles*, p. 393.

² *Ἐκλέγειν* is used frequently of this "choice." See, *e.g.*, Deut. iv. 37, vii. 7, x. 15; xiv. 2, Ps. cxxxiv. (cxxxv.) 4, etc.

³ *Ἐκλεκτός* is used very widely in the LXX., and represents no fewer than twenty different Hebrew words. This is of itself significant, and should prevent us from attempting to fix too hard and fast a meaning upon it in the New Testament. It is used of the whole nation in Ps. civ. (cv.) 6, 43, cv. (cvi.) 5, and elsewhere; but also of individuals, as Moses, Ps. cv. (cvi.) 23; Joshua; Num. xi. 28; and David, Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.), 19.

⁴ With Ex. xix. 5, *ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων· ἐμὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλῆιον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον*, cf. Tit. ii. 14 (*λαὸς περιούσιος*) and 1 Pet. ii. 9: *γένος ἐκλεκτὸν, βασιλῆιον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* (this last phrase is the LXX rendering of the same phrase *הַכֹּהֲנִים* in Mal. iii. 17); and cf. also Eph. i. 14: *εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως*.

⁵ Rom. i. 6, 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; cf. S. Jude, ver. 1.

Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,"¹ and elsewhere charges them to "make their calling and election sure" (2 Pet. i. 10). Such language can only be used of an election to privilege. Among the Apostles' converts were many who were in danger of falling away, and of committing grievous sins, and yet they are all alike regarded as "called" and "elect," or chosen. Clearly, then, the "called" and "elect" are identical; and the Apostles, in using this language, are writing to their converts as chosen and called by God to the high privilege of being His people.

The same kind of language is found in the writings of many of the early Fathers,² indicating that they also held that the Christian Church had stepped into the place of the Jews, and that therefore its members could

¹ 1 Pet. i. 1. Cf. ii. 9 (ἐκλεκτὸν γένος), v. 13 (συνεκλεκτή), and Col. iii. 12; and note that it was of an election to *privilege* that our Lord spoke when He said, "Have I not *chosen* (ἐξελεξάμην) you twelve, and one of you is a devil"? S. John vi. 70.

² See Clement of Rome, c. lxiv., where he speaks of God as having elected our Lord Jesus Christ, and us by Him, to εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον. ἐκλεκτός is a "favourite word" with Clement (Lightfoot). It occurs at least eight times in his Epistle (see cc. i. ii. vi. xlv. xlix. lii. lix.), but there is nothing that is absolutely determinative of his use, though it is probable that he uses it of the Church generally, as he certainly does κλητός. See the salutation: Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικίᾳ Κόρινθον, κλητοῖς, κ.τ.λ. But it is possible that ἐκλεκτός sometimes slides into a further meaning, e.g. in ii.: εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι μετὰ δέους καὶ συνειδήσεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ; xlix.: ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ; lix.: ἱκεσίαν ποιούμενοι ὅπως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν καθριθμημένον τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ . . . διαφυλύξῃ. Ignatius of Antioch certainly uses ἐκλεκτός in the sense of ecclesiastical election. See the salutation to the Epistle to the Trallians: ἐκκλησία ἀγία τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ αξιοθέῳ, κ.τ.λ. Cf. also the salutation to his Epistle to the Ephesians (ἐκλελεγμένην). Hermas uses it several times of the Church. See *Vis.* i. 3, iii. 5, iv. 2. Justin Martyr speaks of Christians being "called" as Abraham was, *Dial.* c. cxix.; and to the same effect Irenæus says that "the Word of God, which formerly elected the patriarchs, has now elected us" (*Adv. hæc.* IV. lviii.).

rightly be addressed as "elect." And there can be no doubt that this view of election is recognised in our own formularies. Not only is the Church described in the Homily for Whitsunday as "an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and *elect* people," but in three out of the four passages where the word "elect" occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, it is used of the Church or body of Christians generally. Thus, in the Collect for All Saints' Day, God is said to have "knit together His *elect* in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body" of His Son. In the Catechism the catechumen is taught to speak of "God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the *elect* people of God"; and in the Baptismal Service, before the child is baptized, we pray that "he may receive the fulness of God's grace, and ever *remain* in the number of His faithful and *elect* children,"—an expression which implies the possibility that he may fail and lose his election.¹ In the fourth passage in which the word occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, the exact meaning to be given to it may be a matter of doubt. It is in the prayer which follows the Lord's Prayer in the order for the Burial of the Dead, where we pray God "shortly to accomplish the number of His *elect*,² and to hasten His kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of His holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory." It is scarcely natural to take the word here as practically equivalent to the baptized; and the probability seems to be that something further is intended here, and in the Article before us,

¹ To these three passages may be added the versicle, "Make thy *chosen* people joyful;" cf. Ps. cxxxii. 9, from which the words are taken.

² The phrase seems to have been originally suggested by the language of S. Clement, quoted in the note on the previous page.

where predestination is described as God's "purpose to deliver those whom He hath *chosen* in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation as vessels made to honour." And if this is so, if, that is, the formularies of the Church while accepting "ecclesiastical election" point also to something beyond it as well, it would appear that in this they faithfully reflect the teaching of Holy Scripture. For while, as we have seen, ecclesiastical election is distinctly taught therein, yet there are some passages the language of which is not really satisfied by this theory. Although it is true that in the Epistles the "called" and the "elect" are identified, yet in our Lord's words in the Gospel, "Many are called (*κλητοί*), but few are chosen" (*ἐκλεκτοί*), they are expressly distinguished. Moreover, while it is admitted that S. Paul's language in Rom. viii. and ix. is *primarily* intended to refer to nations, and to the election of the Christian Church to privilege, yet it is impossible to exclude from his thought something further. The use of the words "prepared unto glory," "fitted unto destruction" (ix. 22, 23), and of the phrase "them He also *glorified*," as the crown of the series of blessings enumerated in viii. 28-30, "prove conclusively that he is looking . . . to the final end and destination of man."¹ It appears, then, that the theory of ecclesiastical election, though perfectly scriptural, does not cover the *whole* teaching of Scripture on the subject; and that we must recognise that there is a further truth, if not definitely revealed, at least implied, in the passages just referred to.

¹ Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 266; cf. p. 347: "It is quite true to say that the election is primarily an election to privilege; yet there is a very intimate connection between privilege and eternal salvation, and the language of ix. 22, 23, 'fitted unto destruction,' 'prepared unto glory,' cannot be limited to a mere earthly destiny."

(b) *The Arminian theory of Predestination.*—The view which is generally associated with the name of Arminius is that God foresaw from all eternity who among men would make a good use of the grace which is freely offered to all, and that *therefore, i.e.* because He foresaw their future merits, He predestined some to final glory. This is sometimes called *predestinatio ex prævisis meritis*, and its leading characteristic is that it does away with the mystery of the doctrine, and makes predestination to life a *consequence of God's foreknowledge*. Since Van Harmen or Arminius¹ only propagated his views at the beginning of the seventeenth century, it is obvious that an Article drawn up in 1553 can have nothing to do with him and his followers. It is therefore quite unnecessary to enter into the history of the Dutch "Remonstrants" and the Synod of Dort.² But there were Arminians before Arminius, and the view of predestination which he and his followers developed and worked into their system was held in a loose and informal way by many before him. Indeed, so far as the Fathers before Augustine can be said to have had any theory of predestination to life beyond that of ecclesiastical election, it would appear that they held it to be a consequence of foreseen merit.

Possible indications of this view have been found in the writings of Justin Martyr³ and Irenæus.⁴ Still

¹ Born in Holland in 1560; professor at Leyden, 1604; and died in 1609.

² See Mosheim, vol. iii. p. 354 (ed. Stubbs); and cf. Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, c. ix.

³ 'Ἄλλ' εἰμαρμένην φαμέν ἀπαράβατον ταύτην εἶναι τοῖς τὰ καλὰ ἐκλεγομένοις τὰ ἄξια ἐπιτημια' καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως τὰ ἐναντία τὰ ἄξια ἐπίχειρα, *Apol.* I. c. xliii.; cf. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 81: "If Justin held the doctrine of predestination at all, it must have been in the Arminian sense—*ex prævisis meritis*."

⁴ "Deus his quidem qui non credunt, sed nullificant eum, infert excitatem . . . Si igitur et nunc, quotquot scilicet non credituros Deus, cum

more clearly is it seen in the teaching of the great Alexandrians, Clement¹ and Origen.² Among later writers it is taught by Chrysostom,³ whose influence became predominant in the East; and although in the West the system of Augustine in the main held the field, yet there are traces of something approaching to the earlier view among some of the schoolmen,⁴ and it has never wanted its defenders in the Church of Rome.⁵

sit omnium præcognitor tradidit eos infidelitati eorum, et avertit faciem ab hujusmodi, relinquens eos in tenebris, *quas ipsi sibi elegerunt*; quid mirum si et tunc nunquam crediturum Pharaonem, cum his qui cum eo erant, tradidit eos suæ infidelitati.”—*Adv. Hær.* IV. xlv. “Nec enim lumen deficit propter eos qui semetipsos excæcaverunt, sed illo perseverante quale est excæcati per suam culpam in caligine constituuntur. Neque lumen cum magna necessitate subjiciet sibi quemquam: neque Deus coget eum, qui nolit continere ejus artem. Qui igitur abstiterunt a paterno lumine et transgressi sunt legem libertatis, per suam abstiterunt culpam, liberi arbitrii et suæ potestatis facti. Deus autem omnia præsciens, utrisque aptas præparavit habitationes.”—IV. lxiv.

¹ Οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεός, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς, *Strom.* VII. xvii. 107. Μεταλαμβάνει δὲ τῆς εὐποίας ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τρὸς ὃ βούλεται ἐπεὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ἐκλογῆς ἀξία γενομένη ψυχῆς αἱρεσίς τε καὶ συνάσκησις πεποιήκεν, *ib.* V. xiv. 141; cf. *Kaye's Clement of Alexandria*, p. 434.

² See especially *Philocalia*, xxv. p. 227 (ed. Robinson): Ἄνωτέρω δὲ ἔστι τοῦ προορισμοῦ ἢ πρόγνωσις* οὗς γὰρ προέγνω, φησί, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* προενατενίσας οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ εἰρμῷ τῶν ἐσομένων, καὶ κατανοήσας ῥοπήν τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῶν τῶνδὲ τιμῶν ἐπὶ εὐσέβειαν καὶ ὀρμὴν ἐπὶ ταύτην μετὰ τὴν ῥοπήν, καὶ ὡς ὅλοι ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιδώσουσι τῷ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν, προέγνω αὐτοὺς, γινώσκων μὲν τὰ ἐνιστάμενα προγινώσκων δὲ τὰ μέλλοντα* καὶ οὕτω προέγνω, προώρισεν, κ.τ.λ.; cf. *Ad Rom.* vii. 17. It is interesting to notice that Calvin frankly owns that Origen and S. Ambrose and S. Jerome were all “Arminians,” and “were of opinion that God dispenses His grace among men according to the use which He foresees that each will make of it,” *Inst.* III. xxii. 8.

* Ὁ μελίζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι. Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν τοῦτο εἶπεν ὁ Θεός; ὅτι οὐκ ἀναμένει, καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ τοῦ τελοῦς τῶν πραγμάτων ἰδεῖν τὸν ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸν οὐ τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τούτων οἶδε τίς μὲν ὁ πονηρὸς, τίς δὲ ὁ μὴ τοιοῦτος.—Chrysost. *In Ep. ad Rom.*, Hom. xvi. (on Rom. ix. 16).

⁴ See the summary of their teaching in Hagenbach, *History of Doctrine*, vol. ii. p. 299; and Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 148.

⁵ “A large number of Jesuits *e.g.* Toletus, Maldonatus, Lessius, Vas-

Turning now to the consideration of the evidence of Scripture, we note that the only passage to which an appeal can with any show of reason be made by the upholders of this theory is Rom. viii. 28, 29: "We know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to His purpose (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς). For whom He foreknew, He also foreordained (προώρισε) to be conformed to the image of His Son," etc.¹ Here the Greek commentators generally have taken κατὰ πρόθεσιν of the *man's* free choice,—a view which is undoubtedly false, as the expression must refer to *God's* purpose (cf. ix. 11: ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ); and προέγνω has been interpreted of foreknowledge of character and fitness. This is plausible; but a careful examination of those passages of Scripture where God's "knowledge" of individuals or nations is spoken of shows that it cannot be maintained. The word γινώσκω, as used of God, "means 'to take note of,' 'to fix the regard upon,' as a preliminary to selection for some special purpose. The compound προέγνω only throws back this 'taking note' from the historic act in time to the eternal counsel which it expresses and executes."² But if the solitary passage which might have seemed to favour the Arminian theory breaks down, there is, on the other hand, a mass of scriptural evidence against it. The language of both Old and New Testament alike is quite decisive that God's

quez, Valentin, and Suarez (while he taught at Rome), admit that predestination to grace, but deny that predestination to glory, is irrespective of merit foreseen. God decrees, they say, to give grace to all, and predestines those who, as He foresees, will correspond to it, the rest being reprobate."—Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 745.

¹ Cf. 1 Pet. i. 1, 2: ἐκλεκτοῖς . . . κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ πατρός.

² Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 217, where reference is made to Ps. i. 6, cxliv. (cxliii.) 3; Hos. xiii. 5; Amos iii. 2; S. Matt. vii. 23, for γινώσκειν. To these may be added Gen. xviii. 19: "I have *known* him, to the end that he may command his children," etc.

election of Israel was not a consequence of foreseen faith or good works. Again and again it is stated that it was "not for their righteousness, for the uprightness of their heart, that they went in to possess the land";¹ and S. Paul appeals to the history of Jacob and Esau in Rom. ix. 10-13 as exhibiting "the perfectly free character of the Divine action, that purpose of God in the world which works on a principle of selection not dependent on any form of human merits or any convention of human birth, but simply on the Divine will as revealed in the Divine call."² And although this election was simply to higher privileges, and had nothing to do with eternal salvation, yet it establishes the general principle that in God's dealings with men there is "an element of inscrutable selectiveness."³ The Arminian theory ignores this fact, and does away with the mystery of the doctrine, whereas S. Paul insists that it is mysterious and unfathomable. According to Arminianism, it is dependent on foreseen good works. S. Paul expressly says it is "not of works," and uses the history of Jacob and Esau to enforce this principle. "The children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, *that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth*, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. Even as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated" (Rom. x. 11-13).

If God be omniscient and almighty, it is impossible to deny (1) that He does foresee from all eternity who will make a good use of grace, and (2) that He does predestinate such to final glory. But the error of the Arminians lies in connecting the two assertions by a

¹ Deut. ix. 5, 6; cf. x. 15; 1 Sam. xii. 22; Jer. xxxi. 1-3; Mal. i. 2, 3, etc.

² Sanday and Headlam, p. 239.

³ Gore in *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 40.

"therefore," and thus making the one a consequence of the other. This introduces an idea of *time*, a "before" and "after," into the Divine life, whereas the foreknowledge of God and His predestination, both being from all eternity, are (if the word may be permitted) *synchronous*, neither being dependent upon the other.

(c) *The Calvinistic theory*.—There remain for consideration the Augustinian and the Calvinistic systems, the latter of which is only a more daring and logical development of the former; as what Augustine suggested in the fifth century, that Calvin said plainly in the sixteenth;¹ and what was left indefinite in the earlier system, was filled up and completed in the later.

Like Arminianism, Calvinism holds that predestination is to *life* and not only to privilege; but, unlike that system (which arose as a reaction from it), it teaches that it is "arbitrary," springing from God's good pleasure, from motives unknown to us. The "five points" of the whole scheme are these—

1. Predestination, including (a) predestination to life, and (b) reprobation or predestination to condemnation.

2. Particular redemption, or the doctrine that Christ died, not for all men, but only for the "elect," *i.e.* those predestined to life.

3. Total ruin, or the doctrine that at the Fall man was wholly deprived of original righteousness.

4. Irresistible grace or effectual calling.

¹ Calvin's *Institutes* were first published in 1536, so that his views had been made public some time before the English Articles were drawn up. But the great discussion on predestination at Geneva, and the publication of his book *De Predestinatione*, only took place in 1552. It has consequently been doubted whether his system had produced much influence in England at the time when the Seventeenth Article was drawn up. (See Bp. H. Browne *On the Articles*, p. 412.) But it is certain that there was much fatalistic teaching among the Anabaptists, which is probably to some extent a reflection of his system. Cf. Hooper's letter quoted in vol. i. p. 22: "They maintain a fatal necessity," etc.

5. Final perseverance.

It must be admitted that on all these points Augustine in the course of the controversy with the Pelagians used language which practically involved the conclusions which Calvin with fatal logic did not shrink from drawing, at the expense of shutting his eyes to a whole series of counter-truths asserted in Scripture. But, on the whole, it appears to be true to say that Calvinism goes beyond Augustinianism in its *definite and systematic* teaching of particular redemption, total ruin, and reprobation.¹ A clear view of the whole system as it was presented and taught in England may be obtained from the "Lambeth Articles" (1595), which state the points with great precision, and from the imposition of which the Church of England was happily saved by the wisdom and good sense of Queen Elizabeth.² The Articles in question are as follows:—

"1. God from eternity hath predestinated some to life, some He hath reprobated to death.

"2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not the prevision of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything which may be in the persons predestinated, but only the will of the good pleasure of God.

"3. Of the predestinated there is a fore-limited and certain number which can neither be diminished nor increased.

"4. They who are not predestinated to salvation will be necessarily condemned on account of their sins.

"5. A true living and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God sanctifying, is not extinguished, does not fall away, does not vanish in the elect either totally or finally.

¹ Augustine's disciple, Prosper, seems definitely to have taught *reprobation* (*Ep. ad Rufinum*, c. xiv.; *App. ad Op. August.* x. p. 168), and both it and particular redemption were maintained by Gottschalc in the ninth century. See Neander's *Church History*, vol. vi. p. 180 *seq.*, and Hagenbach's *History of Doctrine*, vol. ii. p. 293 *seq.*, with the references there given.

² Cf. vol. i. p. 53. See Perry's *English Church History*, part ii. p. 351 *seq.*

"6. A truly faithful man, that is, one endowed with justifying faith, is certain by the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and his eternal salvation through Christ.

"7. Saving grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all men, by which they might be saved if they would.

"8. No man can come to Christ except it be given to him, and unless the Father draw him. And all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come unto the Son.

"9. It is not placed in the will or power of every man to be saved."¹

No words are needed to point out how alien is the whole tone and temper of this narrow and harsh dogmatism from the wise moderation with which the Seventeenth Article is framed. A comparison of the two documents

¹ "1. Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.

"2. Causa moveus aut efficiens prædestinationis ad vitam non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

"3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

"4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

"5. Vera, viva et justificans fides, et spiritus Dei sanctificans non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in electis aut finaliter aut totaliter.

"6. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

"7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voluerint.

"8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre ut veniant ad filium.

"9. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari."

Specimens of various Calvinistic Confessions drawn up on the Continent may be found in Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 162 seq.

is sufficient to show that the Article is not favourable to the Calvinistic theory, which, indeed, is directly contrary to Scripture in its *limitation* of Divine grace to a few;¹ and assertion of its *irresistible character*² in those few, to say nothing of the dreadful dogma of reprobation, which was considered by Calvin as an integral part of his system, and on which the Article is wholly silent.³ Further evidence that the Church of England is not favourable to the Calvinistic scheme will be found in the remarks offered above on Articles IX. and XVI.;⁴ and the last paragraph of the Article now under consideration will presently be shown to be aimed at two of the most dangerous tenets of the same system.

(d) *The Augustinian theory.*—The teaching of Augustine on the subject of predestination has exercised profound influence over the whole Western Church. In the controversy with the Pelagians he was led to formulate his views and to discuss the question thoroughly, and his teaching will be found fully stated in his works,

¹ Particular redemption is directly contrary to such passages of Holy Scripture as S. John iii. 16–17; 1 Tim. ii. 3–6, etc. Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 11, where S. Paul speaks of the possibility of a brother perishing, even one “for whom Christ died”; which on the Calvinistic hypothesis is an impossibility.

² Against the theory of “irresistible grace” it is perhaps sufficient to refer to S. Paul’s dread lest he himself might prove a castaway, 1 Cor. ix. 27; and the whole tenor of his Epistles, in every one of which his readers are assumed to be in a state of grace which is *real*, but from which they *may* fall, and in which they are therefore exhorted to continue.

³ The word “reprobate” (*ἀδόκιμος*, Vulg. *reprobus*) occurs occasionally in the New Testament, the key passage being Rom. i. 28 (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27), which shows that only those are blinded and hardened and become reprobate who have deliberately flung aside and scorned the knowledge of God, which they already possessed. In Rom. ix. 22, S. Paul purposely uses an indefinite form *κατηρητισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν*, whereas, when he speaks of the vessels of honour, he says expressly that *God προητοίμασεν*. See on the whole passage Sanday and Headlam, p. 261.

⁴ Cf. vol. i. p. 51 *seq.*

De Dono Perseverantiae and *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum*. In these he takes up the position (1) that predestination is to *life*, and not merely to privilege; (2) that it is "arbitrary," *i.e.* that the reason why one is predestinated to life and another is not, is unknown to us; and thus (3) the reason is not foreseen faith; (4) only those endowed with the gift of final perseverance can be saved; but why this gift is granted to one and withheld from another, lies in the inscrutable will of God. His teaching has been made the subject of an admirable study by Professor Mozley, and the conclusion at which he arrives is, that while Augustine is *right* in recognising fully that Scripture *does* speak of predestination to life, yet he is *wrong* in ignoring the fact that Scripture is twosided on this great question. "If one set of passages, taken in their natural meaning, conveys the doctrine of predestination, another conveys the reverse. The Bible in speaking of mankind, and addressing them on their duties and responsibilities, certainly speaks as if all had the power to do their duty or not, when laid before them; nor would any plain man receive any other impression from its language than that the moral being had freewill, and could determine his acts one way or another. So that sometimes speaking one way and sometimes another, Holy Scripture as a whole makes no assertion, or has no definite doctrine on this subject."¹ "The characteristic of S. Augustine's doctrine compared with the scriptural one is, that it is a *definite and absolute doctrine*. Scripture, as a whole, as has been said, only informs us of a mystery on the subject; that is to say, while it informs us that there is a truth on the subject it makes no consistent statement of it, but asserts contrary truths, counterbalancing those passages which convey the predestinarian doctrine by passages as plain the other way:

¹ *Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 38.

but S. Augustine makes predestinarian statements, and does not balance them by contrary ones. Rather he endeavours to explain away those contrary statements of Scripture. Thus he evades the natural force of the text that God would have all men to be saved, by supposing that it only means that no man is saved except through the will of God, or that "all men" means not all men, but some out of all classes and ranks of men."¹ The criticism then to be offered upon the Augustinian scheme is, that it is a onesided development of scriptural truth. What it gains in consistency it loses in truth. It is right to a great extent in its affirmations, and wrong to a great extent in its denials. It is right in asserting that predestination is to life, and that the ground of it is inscrutable by us; wrong in denying that sufficient grace is given to all, and that salvation lies in the power of all men.

The four principal theories of predestination have now been stated, and reasons have been given for not deeming any one of them entirely satisfactory. How then, if all these are rejected, is the Seventeenth Article to be understood? *In exactly the same way as these passages of Scripture which speak of predestination, i.e.* "as containing one side of the whole truth respecting grace and freewill, the side, namely, of grace or the Divine power; but not at all as interfering with anyone's belief in a counter truth of man's freewill and originality as an agent. And in this sense it only excludes a Pelagian, and not such as are content to hold a mystery on the subject, and maintain the Divine power in conjunction with man's freewill."² The fact is, that the Bible lays down apparently contrary truths, both of which have yet to be held by one who would hold the whole truth. Freewill and predestination are both taught in the Bible; and though we cannot

¹ *Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 155. ² *Mozley, op. cit.* p. 333.

see at present *how* they are compatible with each other, yet if, in the interests of logical consistency, we are led to deny either one of them, we shall find ourselves involved in errors and difficulties from which there is no escape. For the present we must be content to hold both as *parts* of the truth, remembering that we know but "in part," and leaving their complete reconciliation to the time when we "shall know, even as we are known."

Some words of Dr. Liddon's may serve to conclude this section. In speaking of the "old controversy between the defenders of the sovereignty of God on the one side, and the advocates of the freewill of man on the other," he says—

"The very idea of God as it occurs to the human mind, and the distinct statements of revelation, alike represent the Divine will as exerting sovereign and resistless sway. If it were otherwise, God would not be Almighty, that is, He would not be God. On the other hand, our daily experience and the language of Scripture both assure us that man is literally a free agent; his freedom is the very ground of his moral and religious responsibility. Are these two truths hopelessly incompatible with each other? So it may seem at first sight; and if we escape the danger of denying the one in the supposed interests of the other, if we shrink from sacrificing God's sovereignty to man's freewill, with Arminius, and from sacrificing man's freedom to God's sovereignty, with Calvin, we can only express a wise ignorance by saying, that to us they seem like parallel lines which must meet at a point in eternity, far beyond our present range of view. We do know, however, that being both true, they cannot really contradict each other; and that in some manner, which we cannot formulate, the Divine sovereignty must

not merely be compatible with, but must even imply, the perfect freedom of created wills.”¹

II. *The Steps which accompany Predestination.*

After having described in scriptural terms what is meant by predestination to life, the Article proceeds, still in close dependence upon Scripture, to describe the several steps or processes which accompany it.

They which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

These several processes, thus described, have been summed up as follows:—(1) Vocation, (2) obedience to vocation through grace, (3) free justification, (4) sonship by adoption, (5) conformity to the image of our Lord, (6) a religious life, and (7) eternal felicity.²

It is right that these various steps by which God's eternal decree is carried out should be thus enumerated in the Article, because they form a most important safeguard against Antinomian perversions of the doctrine, showing how much is really involved in *predestination to life*. Though we cannot, with Arminius, say that foreseen good works are the *ground* of such predestination, yet we *can* say that they are involved in it; and that where there is predestination to eternal felicity,

¹ Liddon's *Elements of Religion*, p. 191. Cf. Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 348.

² Bishop Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 252.

there is also predestination to obedience and to conformity to the image of our Lord. This was fully brought out by Bishop Bancroft at the Hampton Court Conference, as the subjoined extract will show.

“The Bishop of London took occasion to signifie to His Majesty, how very many in these daies, neglecting holinesse of life, presumed too much of persisting of grace, laying all their religion upon predestination, If I shall be saved, I shall be saved; which he termed a desperate doctrine, showing it to be contrary to good divinity and the true doctrine of predestination, wherein we should reason rather *ascendendo* than *descendendo*, thus, ‘I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbour, I follow my vocation, etc.; therefore I trust that God hath elected me, and predestinated me to salvation’; not thus, which is the usual course of argument, ‘God hath predestinated and chosen me to life, therefore though I sin never so grievously, yet I shall not be damned; for whom He once loveth, He loveth to the end.’”¹

III. *The practical Effect of the Doctrine.*

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as

¹ Dean Barlow's account of “the sum and substance of the Conference” at Hampton Court. Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 180.

because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God : so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living (*impurissimæ vitæ securitatem*), no less perilous than desperation.

Briefly, this rather wordy paragraph amounts to this—

(a) For “godly persons” the doctrine is full of comfort, as tending to establish and confirm their faith, as well as to kindle their love towards God. It acts upon them as the sense of a lofty destiny often acts upon men, encouraging them to do and dare all things, secure that the difficulties and dangers which lie before them cannot really hinder the accomplishment of their designs. In this lay the real strength of the Calvinistic creed, and of the Puritan character which it trained and developed. On the other hand, in systems where there is little or no sense of God's power carrying out His purposes with resistless force through His chosen instruments, there the character trained under them is likely to be deficient in fibre and tenacity of purpose. So Dean Milman has, in a striking passage, pointed out the weakness of Pelagianism: “No Pelagian ever has, or ever will, work a religious revolution. He who is destined for such a work must have a full conviction that God is acting directly, immediately, consciously, and therefore with irresistible power, upon him and through him. It is because he believes himself, and others believe him to be, thus acted upon, that he has the burning courage to undertake, the indomitable perseverance to maintain, the inflexible resolution to

die for his religion; so soon as that conviction is deadened his power is gone. . . . He who is not predestined, who does not declare, who does not believe, himself predestined as the author of a great religious movement, he in whom God is not manifestly, sensibly, avowedly, working out His pre-established designs, will never be saint or reformer."¹

(b) For those whom the Article calls "curious (*i.e.* inquisitive) and carnal persons" it is most dangerous and perilous to dwell on the mystery, as it exposes them to a twofold danger, since (1) if they believe that they are *not* predestined to life it urges them to despair, while (2) if they believe that they *are* so predestined it leads them into recklessness and Antinomianism.

Both dangers were terribly apparent during the period of the Reformation, when this subject exercised so strong a fascination over men's minds. Many were taking up the "desperate" doctrine referred to by Bancroft, and saying, "If I shall be saved, I shall be saved," and thus became utterly reckless of their actions and conduct; while others were driven to despair by the conviction that they were "reprobate."² Of this Foxe, the martyrologist, gives a remarkable instance, in his account of the death of John Randall, of Christ's College, Cambridge, who destroyed himself in a fit of religious desperation: "He was found in his study hanging by his girdle, before an open Bible, with his dead arm and finger stretched pitifully towards a

¹ Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. p. 150.

² It was evidently because of this danger that the clergy were exhorted in the "Injunctions" of 1559 to "have always in a readiness such comfortable places and sentences of Scripture as do set forth the mercy, benefits, and goodness of Almighty God towards all penitent and believing persons," in order that "the vice of damnable despair may be clearly taken away." Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol. ii. p. 218.

passage on predestination";¹ and both the dangers are alluded to in a passage in one of Luther's letters, which bears a striking resemblance to the language of our own Article.

"Men should not turn their eyes on the secret sentence of election, foreknowledge, and predestination, as they are called; for such speeches lead to doubt, security, or despair,—are you elected? no fall can hurt you, and you cannot perish,—are you not elected? there is no remedy for it. These are shocking speeches, and men ought not to fix their hearts on such thoughts; but the gospel refers us to the proclaimed word of God, wherein He has revealed His will, and through which He will be known and will work."²

IV. *Two Considerations calculated to guard the Doctrine from Abuses.*

The last paragraph of the Article gives two rules which seem more particularly intended to guard against the Calvinistic tenet of particular redemption. They are the following:—

(a) **We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally (generaliter) set forth to us in Holy Scripture.**

(b) **In our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God.**

¹ Froude, *History of England*, vol. ii. p. 81; cf. Foxe, iv. p. 694.

² Luther's *Letters*, No. 1753. There are two expressions in the English of this second paragraph of our Article on which a note may be useful—(1) "curious" in the phrase "curious and carnal persons" simply means inquisitive (cf. Ecclus. iii. 23: "Be not curious in unnecessary matters"), (2) "wretchlessness" (Latin, *securitas*) is only another form of the word "recklessness." It occurs with various forms of spelling. In modern editions it invariably appears as "wretchlessness," but in the edition of 1553 it is spelt "rechielesnesse"; in 1571, "rechelessnesse."

In the first of these rules the English sounds somewhat ambiguous, but there can be no doubt that "generally" here means "universally," *i.e.* of God's promises *as applying to all men*, and not, as the Calvinistic party asserted, only to a particular class consisting of a few favourites of Heaven. This interpretation is rendered certain by the corresponding passage in the *Reformatio Legum*, which has been already quoted, where God's promises to the good, and threats to the evil, are spoken of as *generaliter propositæ* in Holy Scripture. The same interpretation was pointed out by Baro in his *Concio ad Clerum* in 1595, in the controversy when the Lambeth Articles were first projected;¹ and was also asserted against the Puritans by Bishop Bancroft at the Hampton Court Conference.² Thus the clause directly condemns the theory of particular redemption.³

The second rule seems equally clear against the doctrine of reprobation. "In our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God"; and that will certainly is that "*all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth*" (1 Tim. ii. 4). The clause is perhaps still more directly aimed against a tenet not unknown to the Calvinists, but finding special favour with the

¹ Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 466.

² Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 181. For this meaning of the word, cf. the Catechism, which speaks of two sacraments ordained by Christ "as generally necessary to salvation," *i.e.* necessary *for all men*; and cf. the use of the word "generally" in the Authorised Version, in 2 Sam. xvii. 11; Jer. xlvii. 48.

³ With the expression "*generaliter propositæ*" cf. the language of Article VII., which says that in Scripture "*æterna vita humano generi est proposita*"; cf. Latimer's *Sermons*, p. 182, ed. 1584. "The promises of Christ our Saviour be *general*; they pertain to *all mankind*. . . . The promises of Christ which be *general* and pertain to the *whole world*."

Anabaptists, which spoke of a secret will of God opposed to His revealed will; so Hooper, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, writes in 1549 of the Anabaptists: "They maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and besides that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will by which He altogether acts under some kind of necessity."¹ Such teaching as this is at once condemned in our Article, which refers us exclusively to the revealed will of God.²

It only remains, for the sake of completeness of treatment, to point out—(1) that there was no Article on the subject of predestination in the Confession of Augsburg; and (2) that at the Council of Trent much perplexity was felt on the subject, and finally a decree was drawn up in most guarded terms so that everyone might agree to it: "No one, so long as he exists in this mortal state, ought so far to presume concerning the secret mystery of Divine predestination as to determine for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinated; as if it were true that he who is justified either cannot sin any more, or if he do sin, that he ought to promise himself a certain repentance; for except by a special revelation it cannot be known whom God hath chosen to Himself."³

¹ *Original Letters*, Parker Society, p. 66.

² It must be admitted that the wording of this particular sentence is not particularly happy, and that Guest had some reason for his desire that it should be altered, because it might be thought to countenance the notion of a secret will of God opposed to "*that* will . . . which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God." See his letter to Cecil among the *State Papers* ("Domestic" Elizabeth, vol. lxxviii. No. 37) referred to in vol. i. p. 45.

³ Sess. VI. c. xii.

ARTICLE XVIII

*De speranda æterna salute tantum
in nomine Christi.*

Sunt et illi anathematizandi qui dicere audent, unumquemque in lege aut secta quam profitetur, esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen naturæ accurate vixerit: cum sacræ literæ tantum Jesu Christi nomen prædicent, in quo salvos fieri homines oporteat.

*Of obtaining eternal Salvation, only
by the Name of Christ.*

They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

THIS Article now stands as it was originally published in 1553.¹ The copula with which it begins is difficult to account for. “They *also* are to be had accursed”: The “et” of the Latin was omitted in 1563, but restored again in 1571, and was perhaps intended to link this Article on to the last clause of Article XVI.: “They are to be condemned (illi damnandi sunt) which say they can no more sin here,” etc.

The language of the Article has not been traced to any earlier source, but there is a section in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* which affords a close parallel to it.

¹ In 1553 and 1563 the title was as follows: “Tantum in nomine Christi speranda est æterna salus”: “We must trust to obtain eternal salvation only by the name of Christ.” The change of construction in 1571 brought it into harmony with the titles of the other Articles, almost all of which now begin in the same way.

“Horribilis est et immanis illorum audacia, qui contendunt in omni religione vel secta, quam homines professi fuerint, salutem illis esse sperandam, si tantum ad innocentiam et integritatem vitæ pro viribus enitantur juxta lumen quod illis præluceat a natura infusum. Autoritate vero sacrarum literarum confixæ sunt hujusmodi pestes. Solum enim et unicum ibi Jesu Christi nomen nobis commendatum est, ut omnis ex eo salus ad nos perveniat.”¹

This section and the Article before us are evidently intended to rebuke the same error; and it has sometimes been thought that the opinion condemned is that which maintains a possibility of salvation for the heathen, and those who have never heard the name of Christ. On a careless reading of the Article such a view may seem probable. But there are two considerations which make strongly against it: (1) The title in the Latin is “*De speranda æterna salute*,” etc.; strictly, “of *hoping* for eternal salvation.” Such a phrase could only be used if the case contemplated was that of those within sound of the gospel, knowing “the name of Christ” and able to “trust to obtain salvation by it.” (2) From the fact that the Article begins with a definite anathema of certain people, and couples the opinion denounced with that condemned in Article XVI., it is clear that it is no vague opinion that is intended to be here rejected, but the positive teaching of a particular set of persons. Now it does not appear that the question of the salvability of the heathen was formally raised by any of the sects of the day; but when we discover that one of the many schools of Anabaptists was teaching, not only that religion was a matter of indifference, but also that the deliberate rejection of the Saviour of the world would not be attended with loss, it

¹ *Reformatio Legum Eccl., De Hæres. c. xi.*

is almost certain that it is against them that this Article is directed.¹ "There are such libertines and wretches," writes Hooper, "who are daring enough in their conventicles not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, but also to call that blessed Seed a mischievous fellow, and deceiver of the world."² So at a somewhat later date (1579) one Matthew Hamant was burnt at Norwich for maintaining that "Christ is not God nor the Saviour of the world, but a mere man, a sinful man, and an abominable idol." There are other indications in the Articles—such as the emphatic language used in Article XV. on Christ who "came to be the Lamb without spot, Who, by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world," and Who was "clearly void" from sin "both in His flesh and in His spirit"—of the necessity there was to guard against teaching of this character; and it certainly was not without cause that the compilers of the Articles introduced into them this strong assertion, that eternal salvation is only to be looked for through the name of Christ.

The Article, then, means neither more nor less than S. Peter's words in Acts iv. 12, which are referred to in it: "In none other is salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." If this text be, as it surely is, reconcilable with a belief in the salvability of the heathen, then so also is this Article, which proclaims that **Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved**, for the one says no more than the other. With regard to the heathen who live and die out of reach of the gospel, Scripture says but little;³ but

¹ Cf. Hardwick, p. 101.

² See vol. i, p. 23.

³ "I hold it to be a most certain rule of interpreting Scripture that it

sufficient is revealed, not only to make us shrink from pronouncing their condemnation, because we are taught not to judge "them that are without" (1 Cor. v. 12, 13), but even to enable us to have a good hope concerning them. God is "the Saviour of *all men*," but "especially of believers" (1 Tim. iv. 10),—an expression which can only mean that others besides Christians or "believers" can be saved. S. Paul also speaks of the "Gentiles which have no law," and yet "do by nature the things of the law," showing "the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith" (Rom. ii. 14, 15); and it is probable that our Lord's parable of the Sheep and the Goats in S. Matt. xxv. is intended to refer primarily to their case.¹ Consequently, whatever individual teachers may have maintained, the Church as a whole has never committed herself to the assertion that the heathen must be lost, nor denied to them the possibility of salvation. Though never brought into covenant with God here, they may be brought to know Him hereafter. But if so, whatever

never speaks of persons when there is a physical impossibility of its speaking to them. . . . So the heathen, who died before the word was spoken, and in whose land it was never preached, are dead to the word; it concerns them not at all: but the moment it can reach them it is theirs, and for them."—Dr. Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, Letter LXV. quoted in Browne *On the Articles*, p. 443.

¹ In this chapter (S. Matt. xxv.) there are three parables: the first two, the Ten Virgins and the Talents, refer directly to the kingdom of heaven, *i.e.* the Church. With the third, the Sheep and the Goats, the case is different. (1) It is spoken of *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, *all the nations*, a phrase which most naturally refers to the heathen world; (2) neither those on the right hand nor those on the left recognise that they have ever seen Christ or ministered to Him on earth. Apparently, then, they had not known Him in this life; and (3) the test by which their lives are judged is the test of works of mercy and kindness, just those "things of the law" which the Gentiles might "do by nature," if they had "the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith."

grace may be theirs here, or glory be granted to them hereafter, they will not have been **saved by the law** (in lege) **or sect which they professed**, but only by Christ, the one Mediator, Who is "the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (S. John i. 9), and to whom, although they knew it not, they ministered, in doing works of mercy to their fellow-men.

If these considerations are carefully borne in mind, it appears to the present writer that there need be no hesitation concerning the acceptance of this Article. It certainly condemns a lax and latitudinarian view which would treat religion as a matter of indifference, and hold that the rejection of Christ mattered not. But Scripture equally condemns this, and speaks in the strongest terms of those who reject the truth, and let it go after they have received it (see [S. Mark] xvi. 16; S. John iii. 18, 19, xii. 48, etc.). But this *letting go* of the true faith was exactly the sin of which so many of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century were guilty, looking on our Lord sometimes as a mere man, and denying Him to be the Saviour of the world; affirming that Holy Scripture was given "only to the weak," and claiming the inner light of the Spirit, and licence therefrom for every kind of profanity.¹ Not without good reason was this Article inserted to condemn them.

¹ See the Nineteenth Article of 1553, which immediately followed that one which has now been considered in the original series. The text of it will be found in vol. i. p. 78, and cf. p. 233.

ARTICLE XIX

De Ecclesia.

Ecclesia Christi visibilis est cœtus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum prædicatur et sacramenta, quoad ea quæ necessario exiguntur, juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur. Sicut erravit ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina et Antiochena: ita et erravit Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda et ceremoniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quæ credenda sunt.

Of the Church.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

THIS Article has remained practically¹ unchanged since the original edition of 1553. It was possibly suggested by the words in the corresponding Article in the Confession of Augsburg: "Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta." But the Anglican Article is more precise and guarded, and has nothing answering to the next words found in the Lutheran Confession: "Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiæ satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum."²

¹ Slight verbal changes were introduced into the English Article in Elizabeth's reign in order to bring it into more exact accordance with the Latin, in which there has been no alteration whatever. "And manner of ceremonies" was added in 1563; and "their" before "faith" omitted in 1571.

² *Confessio Augustana*, c. vii., De ecclesia.

The object of the Article appears to be twofold: (1) to give such a definition or description of the visible Church as shall exclude the claim of the Roman Church to be the only true Church, while not embracing under the terms of the definition the various sects of Anabaptists and others then springing up; and (2) to deny the claim of the Roman Church to infallibility.

That some such polemical object was intended by those who framed the description in the first part of the Article appears from the following passage in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, between which and the Article there is evidently a very close connection:—

“Etiam illorum insania legum vinculis est constringenda, qui Romanam Ecclesiam in hujusmodi petra fundatam esse existimant, ut nec erraverit, nec errare possit; cum et multi possint ejus errores ex superiore majorum memoria repeti, et etiam ex hac nostra proferri, partim in his quibus vita nostra debet informari, partim etiam in his quibus fides debet institui. Quapropter illorum etiam intolerabilis est error, qui totius Christiani orbis universam ecclesiam solius episcopi Romani principatu contineri volunt. Nos enim eam quæ cerni potest ecclesiam sic definimus ut omnium cœtus sit fidelium hominum, in quo sacra Scriptura sincere docetur, et sacramenta (saltem his eorum partibus quæ necessariae sunt) juxta Christi præscriptum administrantur.”¹

To a later date belongs the Homily for Whitsunday, first published in 1563, and ascribed to the authorship of Bishop Jewell. But it is interesting to notice that it introduces a description of the Church which is evidently suggested by that in the Article into a similar polemical passage combating the claims of the Church of Rome.

“But now herein standeth the controversy, whether

¹ *De Hæres.* c. xxi., *De Romana Ecclesia et potestate Romani pontificis.*

all men do justly arrogate to themselves the Holy Ghost, or no. The Bishops of Rome have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto, reasoning for themselves after this sort. The Holy Ghost, say they, was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church: but we are the chief heads and the principal part of the Church: therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever; and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities and oracles of the Holy Ghost. That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you first what the true Church of Christ is, and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how well they agree together.

“The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God’s faithful and elect people, *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone.* And it hath always three notes or marks whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith.”¹

The connection between the description here given and that in the Article is obvious. That in the Homily is little more than a rhetorical amplification of that given in the Article. The chief difference is that the Homily adds a third note to the two given in the Article, namely, “the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.”² It may, however, fairly be argued that even

¹ “The second part of the sermon for Whitsunday.” The Homilies, p. 494 (ed. S.P.C.K.).

² This “note or mark” is also added in the “Short Catechism” issued together with the Articles in 1553 (see Dixon’s *History of the Church of*

this is no substantial addition, because it is really included in the right administration of the sacraments, which must involve their administration by properly qualified persons, and to those only who are properly qualified to receive them.¹

The main subjects to be considered in connection with this Article are the following :—

1. The description of the visible Church.
2. The statement that the Church of Rome hath erred in matters of faith.

I. The Description of the visible Church.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

It will be convenient to consider separately each term in this description.

England, vol. iii. p. 528), where it is said that "the marks of this Church are : first, pure preaching of the gospel ; then, brotherly love, out of which, as members of all one body, springeth goodwill of each to other ; thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lord's sacraments, according to the ordinance of the gospel ; last of all, brotherly correction and excommunication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend their lives. This mark the holy Fathers termed discipline." See *Liturgies of King Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 513. Somewhat to the same effect we read in Nowell's *Catechism*, published in 1570, that the "marks of the visible Church are the sincere preaching of the gospel, that is to say, of the benefits of Christ, invocation and administration of the sacraments," and it is added that "in the same Church, if it be well ordered, there shall be seen to be observed a certain order and manner of government, and such a form of ecclesiastical discipline," etc. See Nowell's *Catechism* (Parker Society), pp. 56, 175 ; cf. also Ridley's *Works* (Parker Society), p. 123.

¹ Cf. Bp. Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 452.

(a) **The visible Church.** The word "Church" ¹ is the English equivalent for the Greek *ἐκκλησία*, which has passed through three stages of meaning. (1) In its classical sense it is not a *religious* word at all, but simply stands for the assembly of the citizens of Athens and (later) of other free Greek cities, called together for the discussion of public business. In this sense it occurs once in the New Testament of the "lawful assembly" (*ἡ ἔννομος ἐκκλησία*) at Ephesus, Acts xix. 39. (2) It obtains a religious connotation first in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, where it is frequently used as the translation of the Hebrew *קָהָל*, for the assembly of the Israelites, especially when gathered for sacred purposes.² In this sense it is found twice in the New Testament, viz. in Acts vii. 38, where S. Stephen speaks of "the Church in the wilderness," and in Heb. ii. 12 in a quotation from the LXX. of Ps. xxii. 22. (3) This Old Testament use of the term prepared the way for the third stage in its usage, in which it is adopted by our Lord as the name of the Society which He came to found on earth. It is so used on two occasions by Him in the Gospels, namely in S. Matt. xvi. 18 (to be noted as its earliest occurrence), "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church" (*οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*), and S. Matt. xviii. 18, where it is said of the erring brother, "If he refuse to hear thee, tell it to the Church; and if he refuse to hear the Church also,

¹ The English word "Church" is ordinarily said to come from the Greek *Κυριακή*. But see the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 694 (ed. ii.), where reasons are given for doubting this derivation.

² It is never used for the Hebrew *קָהָל* for which *συναγωγή* is the regular equivalent. This word is also used regularly in the first four books of the Pentateuch for *קָהָל*; but from Deuteronomy onwards, though *συναγωγή* is still occasionally used for it, *ἐκκλησία* is more usually employed. See Deut. iv. 10, ix. 10, xviii. 16, etc.; and on the history of the word in general, see Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 1.

let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican." Owing probably to its use in this sense by our Lord Himself, we find on turning to the Acts and Epistles that it is the familiar designation of the Christian Society, used sometimes for the Society *as a whole*, throughout the world, 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. i. 22;¹ Phil. iii. 6, etc.; sometimes for the Church in a particular place, as "the Church which was in Jerusalem," Acts viii. 1; "the Church of God which is at Corinth," 1 Cor. i. 2; "the Church of the Thessalonians," 1 Thess. i. 1; or "the Church in Ephesus," Rev. ii. 1; sometimes even for a particular congregation gathered together in some house. So we read of Prisca and Aquila, and "the Church that is in their house" (Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19), and of Philemon, and the Church in his house (Philem. 2, and cf. Col. iv. 15).² This varying usage of the word in its Christian sense is faithfully reflected in the language of our own Articles, which speak sometimes of "the Church" (Art. XX.), or "the visible Church" (Art. XIX.) as a whole, sometimes of "every particular or national Church" (Art. XXXIV.), such as "the Church of Jerusalem," of "Alexandria and Antioch," as well as "the Church of Rome" (Art. XIX.).

The phrase employed in the Article before us, "the *visible* Church," is important. It obviously indicates that the Church is a definite ascertainable body, which can be pointed out to men, and distinguished from any other bodies or societies claiming identity or similarity with it.

¹ This usage is especially characteristic of the Epistle to the Ephesians, in which the conception of one Catholic Church stands out with peculiar clearness. See Eph. i. 22, iii. 10, v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32.

² It may be noted that the word can also be used for "any gathering" of men assembled by chance or tumultuously, as it is by the "town clerk" in his speech at Ephesus, Acts xix. 32, 41. Its use for the *building* in which Christians meet together for worship is post-biblical, and apparently not found before the third century at the earliest.

What the distinguishing marks of the Church are the Article proceeds to state, and these will presently be explained. But before this can be done, the phrase before us requires further consideration.

At the time when the Articles were drawn up there was in some quarters a tendency to attach little importance to the notion of a "visible Church," and to speak much of an "invisible Church," consisting of true believers known only to God, wherever they might be found, outside and independent of all external organisation.¹ That God *does* know who are really His, in whatever society or body they may be found, is of course perfectly true, and what no Christian can deny. But when this is said, there is really nothing more that can be said of an "invisible Church." Its existence

¹ See a startling exposition of this view in Hooper's *Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*: "I believe and confess one only Catholic and Universal Church, which is an holy congregation and assembly of all faithful believers, which are chosen and predestinate unto everlasting life, before the foundations of the world were laid: of whose number I count myself, and believe that I am, through the only grace and mercy of the Father, and by the merits of my good Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and not by means of my good works and merits, which indeed are none.

"I believe that this Church is invisible to the eye of man, and is only to God known; and that the same Church is not set, compassed, and limited within a certain place or bounds, but is scattered and spread abroad throughout all the world; but yet coupled together in heart, will, and spirit by the bond of faith and charity, having and altogether acknowledging one only God, one only head and mediator Jesus Christ, one faith, one law, one baptism, one spiritual table, wherein one meal, and one spiritual drink, is ministered to them unto the end of the world. This Church containeth in it all the righteous and chosen people, from the first righteous man unto the last that shall be found righteous in the end of the world: and therefore I do call it universal. For as touching the visible Church, which is the congregation of the good and of the wicked, of the chosen and of the reprobate, and generally of all those which say they believe in Christ, I do not believe that to be the Church, because that Church is seen of the eye, and the faith thereof is in visible things."—Later writings of Bishop Hooper (Parker Society), p. 40.

does not practically concern us; for to say of any particular individuals that they belong to the true (invisible) Church, and of others that they belong only to the visible body, involves a serious confusion of thought, since the very act of pointing out any members of this "invisible Church" makes it at once a "visible" one; and for man to say who does or who does not belong to it is to claim the prerogatives of God, and to assume the power to see into the hearts of men. Thus the phrase "the invisible Church" was mischievous and misleading, and led men to attach little importance to the Divinely appointed external organisation of the historical Church founded by our Lord; and we may be thankful that those who are responsible for the Article ignored it altogether and spoke only of that body or society of which Scripture speaks, namely, "the visible Church of Christ."¹

That our Lord intended to found a Church, and that this Church was to be "visible," must now be shown. The passage already quoted from S. Matt. xvi. 18 is conclusive evidence that it was our Lord's purpose to found a Church; and though, as has been previously mentioned, the word *ἐκκλησία* only occurs on two occasions in the Gospels, yet in the former of the two passages it is closely connected, if not expressly identified with "the kingdom of heaven," which is the ordinary title by which our Lord refers to the new order of things which He came to inaugurate,

¹ This silence about any "invisible Church" is all the more noteworthy because the Thirteen Articles drafted in 1538 had distinctly recognised *two* senses of the word Church: "unam, qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium sanctorum et vere fidelium, qui Christo capiti vere credunt et sanctificantur Spiritu ejus. Hæc autem vivum est et vere sanctum Christi corpus mysticum, sed soli Deo cognitum, qui hominum corda solus intuetur. Altera acceptio est qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium hominum qui baptizati sunt in Christi," etc.—Art. V. See Hardwick, p. 263.

and the Society which was to be established on earth. That this "kingdom," though "not of this world" (S. John xviii. 36), was nevertheless intended to be a "visible" one, embracing good and bad alike, is indicated in more than one parable; *e.g.* that of the Tares (S. Matt. xiii. 24-30), the Draw-net (vers. 47-50), and the Wedding Garment (xxii. 1-14). It is intended to embrace all nations of the earth (xxviii. 19). The rite of baptism is appointed as the method of admission to it (*ib.*, cf. S. John iii. 3-5); a visible rite is instituted as the means of supporting the life of its members (S. Matt. xxvi. 26; S. John vi. 51), and men are commissioned and "sent" with power to remit and retain sins (S. John xx. 21-23). All this implies a definite, ascertainable body with an outward organisation, a body, or society, which can be described as a "visible" one. And when we turn to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles we find abundant evidence that the actual existing ἐκκλησία was such. Throughout the Acts baptism is the rite of admission to it (Acts ii. 38, 41, viii. 12, xvi. 15, etc.); "continuing steadfastly in the breaking of the bread" is one of the characteristics of believers (ii. 42, cf. ii. 46 and xx. 7); and "elders" are "appointed in every Church" (xiv. 23); and it may be safely said that wherever the "Church" is mentioned, the language used is only capable of being applied to a visible body. Thus a "persecution arose against the Church" (viii. 1), the Church was "gathered together" (xiv. 27), "saluted" (xviii. 22), "confirmed" (xvi. 5). The same is true in regard to the Epistles. In every case S. Paul writes to members of a definite society, consisting, as his letters only too plainly show, of professed believers, some of whom were guilty of grievous sins,—a mixed body, in which the evil are mingled with the good; and if further proof be required that this is

the character of the *ἐκκλησία* as described in Holy Scripture, it may be found in the Epistles to the seven Churches of Asia (Rev. ii., iii.), which are clearly addressed to visible organised societies, and which similarly recognise the existence of the evil as well as the good in those societies. Thus everywhere throughout Scripture it is "the visible Church" which is spoken of, to which the promises are made, and in which the hope of salvation is held out.

(b) This "visible Church" is described as **a congregation of faithful men** (*cœtus fidelium*). Stress may fairly be laid on the word "congregation" as implying that the Church is in some way united so as to be a definite body with an organism and a life of its own, for, as has been truly pointed out, a *congregation* is more than an *aggregation*. It means a body or society. "There is a great difference between an aggregation and a body. A body is not merely a heap of members, . . . but it is a system of members knit together into one organism and pervaded by one life. . . . So the Church is a living organism deriving from Christ, who is its Head, the life of the Holy Ghost."¹

"Faithful" in this connection signifies "professed believers." It cannot be taken as implying anything as to the character of the faith in the members of the Church, or as if it indicated the presence of a true and lively faith in all who belong to the body; but it refers simply to those who "profess and call themselves Christians." That this is so is shown by the fact that a later Article (XXVI.) expressly states (in full accordance, as has been already proved, with the teaching of Scripture) that "in the visible Church the evil are ever mingled with the good." Thus the Church consists of bad as well as good, and therefore the word "faithful" must be understood in the sense explained above.

¹ Goulbourn's *Holy Catholic Church*, p. 9.

(c) We now come to the "notes" of the Church, of which the Article gives two. The first is this: that in the Church **the pure word of God is preached**. That we are right in regarding this as one of the necessary notes or marks of the Church may fairly be inferred from many passages of Scripture. Our Lord's charge to His Apostles after the resurrection was to "make disciples of all nations," not only "baptizing them," but also "teaching them to observe all things" that He had commanded (S. Matt. xxviii. 19). The Church of the first days is described by S. Luke as continuing "steadfast in the apostles' teaching," as well as in "the fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers" (Acts ii. 42). S. Paul was sent to "preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). He charges Timothy to "preach the word" (2 Tim. iv. 2), to "hold fast the form of sound words" which he has heard (2 Tim. i. 13); and generally, throughout the Apostolic Epistles, it is assumed that there is a definite body of teaching to be handed on by the Church and her ministers.¹ That definite body of teaching, so far as necessary doctrine is concerned, we believe (as was shown under Article VI.) to be contained in Holy Scripture. "Preaching," as Hooker reminds us, is the "open publication of heavenly mysteries."² Thus the "pure word of God is preached" wherever the main doctrines of the gospel are openly taught and proclaimed. And since the main doctrines are summarised in those Creeds to which the Church of England expressly adheres, and which she declares "ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture,"³ it may reasonably be concluded that all who are in possession of the Creeds of the Church, and proclaim the doctrine contained in them, are so far forth

¹ See, e.g., 2 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 13-16; S. Jude 3.

² *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V. c. xviii.

³ Article VIII.

in possession of "the pure word of God," and fulfilling their duty of preaching it, as to satisfy the requirements of this note of the Church.

(*d*) A second note of the Church is given in the following words: **The sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.** It has already been shown that our Lord appointed baptism as the rite of admission to His Church, and that the Eucharist was instituted with the charge, "Do this in remembrance of Me." By it, as S. Paul says, we are to "show forth the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). It is therefore a rite for all time, and in the face of these declarations it can scarcely be doubted that the due administration of the sacraments must be a necessary mark of the Church, and that any body of Christians not possessing sacraments thereby forfeits all claim to be regarded as a branch of Christ's visible Church. A further question may be raised as to what constitutes a *due* administration of the sacraments. And to this it may be replied that all the conditions necessary for the validity of sacraments must be fulfilled. There must be the proper "matter," *i.e.* in the one case water, in the other "bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received"; as well as the proper form of words. It would seem also that a regularly constituted ministry is implied in this note of the Church;¹ for though the prevailing opinion in the Church has ever been that baptism (1) with water, and (2) in the name of the Holy Trinity, is valid by whomsoever it may be administered, these being, as the Prayer Book says, "essentials of baptism," yet for the consecration and administration of the Holy Communion it has ever

¹ The question of the Episcopal ministry and its necessity is considered elsewhere, and is therefore not touched upon here.

been held that the action of a rightly ordained minister is required.¹ Unless these various conditions were satisfied, it would be impossible to maintain that the sacraments were "duly (recte)² ministered according to Christ's

¹ This is not the place to enter fully into the question of the validity of lay baptism, which is carefully vindicated by Hooker (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V. c. lxii.). But in view of the distinction drawn in the text between the two sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist as far as the action of an ordained minister is concerned, it may be well to explain the scriptural grounds on which the Church is justified in maintaining that lay baptism is valid, while she never permits a lay consecration of the Eucharist. Briefly, then, it may be said that there are various indications in the New Testament that no importance is attached to the minister of baptism. In the Gospels we are expressly told that during our Lord's earthly ministry "Jesus baptized not Himself, but His disciples" (S. John iv. 2). In the Acts of the Apostles we read that when the Holy Ghost had come on the household of Cornelius, Peter, though apparently the only apostle or Christian minister present, "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (Acts x. 48). The Samaritans were baptized by Philip the deacon, though the Holy Ghost was not given till the hands of the apostles were laid on them (Acts viii. 12-17). Of the men at Ephesus it is said that "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them" (Acts xix. 5, 6); the natural inference from these words being that the act of baptism was not performed by the apostle himself; an inference which is raised almost to a certainty by S. Paul's own words in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which show that his usual custom was not to baptize himself, "for God sent" him "not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 14-17). These passages seem amply sufficient to warrant the Church in relaxing the rule that a regularly ordained minister is required for the ministerial act. But no such series of passages can be cited with regard to the Eucharist, and therefore the Church has never felt justified in sanctioning any relaxation of her rule that the Society should act through her regularly commissioned officers.

² The difference between "recte" and "rite" as used in the Articles is not very great, both words being capable of being rendered by the same English word "duly." But "rite" includes a wider reference to due ecclesiastical order than "recte" does, as may be seen by a comparison of the following passages: Art. XIX. "Sacraments be *duly* (recte) ministered." XXV. Sacraments were ordained "that we should *duly* (rite) use them." XXVII. "They that receive baptism *rightly* (recte) are grafted into the Church." XXVIII. "To such as *rightly* (rite),

ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.”¹

II. *The Statement that the Church of Rome hath erred in Matters of Faith.*

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

The object of this clause is not to condemn the Roman Church as apostate, but simply to deny her claim to infallibility. Whatever may be said about the infallibility of the Church as a whole, it is clear from history that no one branch of the Church can claim for herself infallibility apart from other branches. So the Article points to the historical fact that in the past the principal Churches of the East have erred, mentioning the three great patriarchates, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, and maintains that similarly the Roman Church

worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread,” etc. XXXII. “That person which is *rightly* (rite) cut off,” etc. XXXVI. “We decree all such to be *rightly* (rite) and orderly consecrated.” Thus the sacraments may be *duly* ministered (recte), *i.e.* they may be *valid*, and yet something wanting for what Hooker calls their “ecclesiastical perfection” (Bk. V. lxii. 15).

¹ A question is sometimes raised here concerning the Church of Rome, in consequence of the denial of the cup to the laity. Can it be said that the sacraments are duly ministered where this practice is followed? And if not, what about the claims of the Church of Rome to be regarded as a branch of Christ’s Church at all? As is shown below, there is really no sort of question that the Church of England *does* recognise the Church of Rome as a true branch of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church, and therefore this clause of the Article cannot have been intended to exclude her. And since where the cup is denied to the laity the sacrament, though mutilated in the administration, is yet valid, both parts being duly consecrated, it may be said that the sacraments “be duly (recte) administered,” etc.

has also "erred." No particular errors are specified in any case; but it is not difficult to point to periods during the great Arian controversy when each of the three Eastern Churches mentioned in the Article fell into serious errors. Thus the Church of Antioch went wrong at the Council of the Dedication in 341, when a defective creed acceptable to the Arians was accepted in lieu of the Nicene faith.¹ The Church of Alexandria certainly "erred" when Athanasius was in banishment, and Gregory or George of Cappadocia ruling the See.² The Church of Jerusalem was also infected with Arianism for a considerable time.³ In the same way the Article states that the Church of Rome has erred in the past. She erred when her Bishop Liberius accepted an Arian creed;⁴ when Zosimus vindicated Pelagius;⁵ and when Honorius accepted the Monothelite heresy.⁶ Later examples of errors might easily be given, but it is probable that those who compiled the Articles were thinking of these earlier ones, and pointing to well-known and admitted facts of history as establishing the general statement that the Church of Rome was liable to error, and as sufficient to justify them for not accepting as necessarily correct the decisions of the Council of Trent. In view of this Council, and any possible decisions that might emanate from it, it was important that the Church of England should make her own position clear, and state beforehand the grounds which she felt would justify her in declining (if necessary) to submit when Rome had formally spoken. The Council, it will be remembered, was

¹ See Bright's *History of the Church*, p. 47.

² *Ib.* pp. 48, 79.

³ Cyril of Jerusalem was originally appointed by the Semi-Arians, and only gave in his adhesion to the Nicene faith about the year 362. See for the Arianism of the Church of Jerusalem, Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 92 *seq.*

⁴ Bright, *op. cit.* p. 87.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 287.

⁶ See Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 427 *seq.*

actually being held when the Articles were drawn up. Fourteen sessions had been held between 1546 and 1551, and among the subjects on which decrees had been passed were the Holy Scriptures (the Apocrypha being declared to be canonical in the fourth session), original sin and justification (sessions five and six), the number and nature of the sacraments (sessions seven to fourteen). It is possible, therefore, that these are referred to in our Article, but it is obviously impossible that the decrees of the Council on Communion in both kinds, or on Purgatory and kindred subjects, or the creed of Pope Pius iv. can have been intended, as these were not drawn up for some years after the Articles were issued.

That the clause before us is not intended to condemn the Roman Church as apostate is clear from the language used. For this the language employed must have been far stronger. The Roman Church is spoken of as a "Church," though an erring one; and although painfully strong language has sometimes been used of that Communion by individuals within the English Church, identifying it with Antichrist and the Babylon of the Apocalypse, yet this has been only the language of individuals. The position formally taken up by the Church of England has never wavered. While lamenting the errors of the Church of Rome, she has never maintained that they amount to apostasy, or destroy her claim to be regarded as a branch of Christ's Church. So in the *Institution of a Christian Man* (1537) it is said that the "Church of Rome, with all the other particular Churches in the world, compacted and united together, do make and constitute but one Catholic Church or body," and "all the particular Churches in the world, which be members of this Catholic Church, may all be called apostolical Churches, as well as the Church of Rome, or any other Church wherein the apostles themselves were

sometime resident.”¹ But an even more convincing proof than language such as this is to be found in the fact that the English Church accepts the Orders of the Church of Rome, and has never denied the priesthood of, or attempted to reordain, any Roman priests who have sought admission to her Communion. If the Church of Rome were regarded as apostate, her ordinations could never be accepted as conveying a valid commission. The fact, then, that they are so accepted in the English Church is conclusive on this point, and further argument is needless. Some words of Hooker may, however, be cited in conclusion, as summing up the whole matter with clearness and fairness.

“The Church of Christ, which was from the beginning, is and continueth unto the end: of which Church all parts have not been always equally sincere and sound. . . . In S. Paul’s time the integrity of Rome was famous; Corinth many ways reprov’d; they of Galatia much more out of square. In S. John’s time Ephesus and Smyrna in far better state than Thyatira and Pergamus were. We hope, therefore, that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still. Other differences between our estate before and now we know none, but only such as we see in Judah; which having sometime been idolatrous became afterwards more

¹ *Formularies of Faith*, p. 55. In the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* (1543), the passage is rewritten, but the recognition of the Church of Rome is equally clear. “The Church of England, Spain, Italy, and Poole be not separate from the unity, but be one Church in God.” “The Church of Rome, being but a several Church, challenging that name of *Catholic* above all other, doeth great wrong to all other Churches . . . for that Church hath no more right to that name than the Church of France, Spain, England, or Portugal,” etc.—*Op. cit.* p. 247.

soundly religious by renouncing idolatry and superstition. . . . The indisposition, therefore, of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us for performing our duty to God ; even as desire of retaining conformity with them would be no excuse if we did not perform that duty.

“Notwithstanding, so far as lawfully we may, we have held and do hold fellowship with them. For even as the Apostle doth say of Israel that they are in one respect enemies, but in another beloved of God, in like sort with Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundry her gross and grievous abominations, yet touching those main parts of Christian truth wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ ; and our hearty prayer unto God Almighty is, that being conjoined so far forth with them, they may at the length (if it be His will) so yield to frame and reform themselves, that no distraction remain in anything, but that we ‘all may with one heart and one mouth glorify God, the Father of our Lord and Saviour,’ whose Church we are.”¹

¹ *Eccl. Polity*, Bk. III. ch. i. § 10.

ARTICLE XX

De Ecclesiæ Autoritate.

Habet Ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem, quamvis Ecclesiæ non licet quicquam instituere, quod verbo Dei scripto adversetur, nec unum Scripturæ locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit divinorum librorum testis et conservatrix, attamen ut adversus eos nihil decernere, ita præter illos nihil credendum de necessitate salutis debet obtrudere.

Of the Authority of the Church.

The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

THIS Article, with the exception of the first or affirmative clause (The Church . . . controversies of faith), dates from 1553, and is almost identical with a passage in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.¹ It has not been traced to any earlier source, and there is nothing corresponding to it in the Confession of Augsburg. The affirmative clause first makes its appearance in 1563, and some doubt has been felt with regard to its source

¹ *Ref. Leg. Eccl.*, De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, c. xi. : "Quamobrem non licet ecclesiæ quicquam constituere, quod verbo Dei scripto adversetur, neque potest sic unum locum exponere ut alteri contradicat. Quanquam ergo divinorum librorum testis sit et custos et conservatrix Ecclesia, hæc tamen prerogativa ei minime concedi debet, ut contra hos libros vel quicquam decernat, vel absque horum librorum testimoniis ullos fidei articulos condat, eosque populo Christiano credendos obtrudat."

and authority. It is *not* found in the Parker MS. signed by the members of the Upper House of Convocation on Jan. 29, 1563. Nor is it contained in an English "minute" of the Articles among the Elizabethan *State Papers*, dated January 31, 1563.¹ On the other hand, it is found in an undated Latin MS. in the *State Papers*, in which it has evidently been introduced *after the original draft was made*.² This is probably the earliest document to contain it, and Hardwick's theory³ is likely to be true, that this is the actual MS. from which the first edition of the Elizabethan Articles was printed, viz. that published by Wolfe, the royal printer, under the direct authority of the Queen herself. Anyhow, this edition contains the clause in question;⁴ and though it is just possible that it was added by the Lower House of Convocation, to which the Articles were submitted after acceptance by the Upper House, yet there is a strong probability that it was inserted by the Queen herself in the exercise of her royal prerogative. However, it was undoubtedly deficient in full synodical authority, and, consequently, some MS. copies of the Articles, as well as some printed editions, omit it.⁵ Of these the most important is the English edition printed by Jugge and Cawood in 1563, to which the Act of Parliament of 1571, requiring subscription to the Articles, made

¹ "Domestic," vol. xxvii. 40.

² *Ib.* 41 A. "The disputed clause in Article XX., filling just one line and somewhat overcrowding the page, was clearly introduced in the same hand after the first draft was made."—Hardwick, p. 140.

³ *Articles*, p. 140.

⁴ Cf. vol. i. p. 31.

⁵ *E.g.* it is omitted (1) in an English draft of the Articles among the *State Papers* ("Domestic," 41), endorsed, "Articles of Religion agreed on, 1562, in the Convocation hous"; (2) in an English MS. signed by the bishops in the Convocation of 1571; (3) in the English edition of Jugge and Cawood of 1563 alluded to in the text; and (4) in one Latin and one English edition of Jugge and Cawood in 1571. See Hardwick, p. 142.

reference.¹ It would appear certain, however, that at the final revision of 1571, if not earlier, the clause was ratified by Convocation;² for when the charge was raised against Archbishop Laud at his trial, that he had himself added the clause to the Articles without the slightest authority, *a transcript attested by a notary public from the original records of Convocation was produced containing the words in question.*³ The records of Convocation unfortunately perished in the great fire of London in 1666; but there is no possible room for doubting that this Article as found in them *did* contain the clause. As Hardwick says, "the testimony of that record was produced upon the trial of Archbishop Laud, in the most open and explicit manner, at a time when it was perfectly accessible to his accusers, or was rather in the hands of his infuriated enemies, and yet 'not one of them ever ventured to question the truth of the assertion, or attempted to invalidate the proofs on which his defence had rested.'"⁴

The words of the disputed clause, it might be added, are (like so many of the additions of 1563) probably suggested by similar language used in the Confession of Würtemberg: "*Credimus et confitemur quod . . . hæc ecclesia habeat jus judicandi de omnibus doctrinis.*"⁵

The object of the clause, and indeed of the whole Article, is to state definitely the powers and offices of the Church, with special reference to (*a*) the errors of

¹ Cf. vol. i. p. 43.

² At his trial Archbishop Laud stated publicly that "'tis plain that after the stir about subscription in the year 1571 the Articles were settled and subscribed unto at last, as in the year 1562, with this clause in them for the Church: for looking further into the records which are in mine own hands, I have found the book of 1563 subscribed by all the Lower House of Convocation in this very year of contradiction, 1571."—Laud's *Works*, vol. vi. p. 68 (A. C. Lib.).

³ Laud, *op. cit.* p. 66.

⁴ *Articles*, p. 144.

⁵ *De Ecclesia*.

the Puritan party, who were inclined to deny to the Church any right to enforce rites or ceremonies beyond those for which "Scripture proof" might be alleged; and (b) the exaggerated view of the authority of the Church in doctrinal matters held by the Romanists, who denied that in the promulgation of necessary doctrine the Church was limited to what was contained in Scripture, or might be proved thereby.

Three main subjects are brought before us in the Article, and require separate consideration—

1. The *legislative* power of the Church with regard to rites or ceremonies.

2. The *judicial* authority of the Church with regard to doctrine.

3. The office of the Church with regard to Holy Scripture.

I. *The Legislative Power of the Church with regard to Rites or Ceremonies.*

The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, that is, she may from time to time make new ones, if she deem it expedient, or she may decree to retain old ones in the face of opposition, or change and abolish existing ones. This power may fairly be called "legislative," and it is analogous to the power exercised in the State by Crown and Parliament, which make new laws and abolish old ones. It was noticed under the last Article that the word "Church" was somewhat ambiguous, being sometimes used for the Church universal and sometimes for any particular or national Church; and the question may be raised in which of these two senses is it here employed. The answer is found by a reference to the last clause of Article XXXIV., which (like the clause before us) was added

in 1563: "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." This merely amplifies the clause now under consideration, and makes it clear that we are to understand it as referring to the power of national or particular Churches, and vindicating the right of the Church of England to such action as was taken from time to time in the revision of the services of the Church. As historical instances, then, of the exercise of this power, we may point to (*a*) the renewal of the baptismal vow prefixed to Confirmation, a new rite decreed for the first time in 1662; (*b*) the retention of the sign of the Cross, in face of much opposition, in 1604; and (*c*) the abolition of the "chrisom," or white vesture, given to the newly baptized in token of the innocency granted to them in baptism. This was retained in the first English Prayer Book in 1549, but dropped at the next revision in 1552. In each of these cases the local or national Church exercised the power inherently belonging to it. But the power is not unlimited; and after stating *what* the power is, the Article proceeds to add two restraining clauses, keeping it within certain well-defined limits.

(*a*) It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written.

(*b*) It ought not to decree anything against the same.

It will be noticed that the rites or ceremonies decreed need not receive any positive support from Scripture. All that is required is that there should be nothing in them that is opposed to or condemned by Scripture. An illustration may make this clear; and a convenient one is furnished by Dean Goulbourn. The Church, in the exercise of her legislative power, might add to the

Book of Common Prayer a new office of thanksgiving on the occasion of the harvest. No scriptural authority need be asked for. But if into such an office "it were proposed to insert some words of adoration to the holy angels as being very possibly the ministers of natural blessings to mankind, this would be a flagrant stretch of the Church's prerogative, since S. Paul condemns the worshipping of angels; and when S. John fell down to worship at the feet of an angel, the being to whom the homage was offered replied, 'See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant.'"¹ It was here that the Puritans went wrong, as they objected to many of the ceremonies of the Church, not because they were contrary to Scripture, but simply because they were not based upon Scripture. To demand "Scripture proof," however, in such matters is seriously to mistake the purpose and object of the Scriptures. They were given "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness" (2 Tim. iii. 16), *i.e.* for moral and doctrinal purposes, not as a guide or directory in matters of ritual. In these the Church possesses the power which is conceded to every society to make rules for the guidance of its own members. The existence of such a power is assumed throughout Scripture. It obviously belonged to the Jewish Church. Although there was an elaborate ritual and ceremonial law with stated feasts ordained by God Himself, yet the Jewish Church claimed and exercised the power to add other feasts, such as Purim and Dedication, to those of Divine appointment. Our Lord's words, "The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe" (S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), imply that power to make regulations still remained with the authorities; and we see from the Acts and the Epistles

¹ Goulbourn's *Holy Catholic Church*, p. 212.

that when the Christian Church was established, such powers were exercised from the first in it as occasion required. Thus we find S. Paul incidentally laying down definite regulations in his Epistles on various details, *e.g.* that men are to worship with the head uncovered, women with the head covered (1 Cor. xi.); on the conduct of public worship by the prophets (1 Cor. xiv. 27); that women are to keep silence in the churches (1 Cor. xiv. 34; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 12). He lays down the general principle, "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40), and appeals to the "custom" of the Churches as if it were final and decisive, and individuals ought to conform to it. "If any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God" (1 Cor. xi. 16).

These passages are sufficient to prove that it was understood from the first that such legislative power was vested in the Church; and it would be superfluous to prove at length that it has in all ages been exercised by national Churches, and that different customs have been followed in different places. Three quotations may, however, be appended in order to show how the matter was regarded in early times.

In his famous "letter to Januarius," Augustine, after speaking of the sacraments, and some things "which we hold on the authority, not of Scripture, but of tradition, and which are observed throughout the whole world," *e.g.* Good Friday, Easter Day, etc., proceeds as follows:—

"There are other things, however, which are different in different places and countries, *e.g.* some fast on Saturday, others do not; some partake daily of the Body and Blood of Christ, others receive it on stated days; in some places no day passes without the sacrifice being offered, in others it is only on Saturday and Sunday, or it may be only on Sunday. In regard to these and all other variable observances which may be met anywhere, one is

at liberty to comply with them or not as he chooses ; and there is no better rule for the wise and serious Christian in this matter than to conform to the practice which he finds prevailing in the Church to which it may be his lot to come. For such a custom, if it is clearly not contrary to the faith nor to sound morality, is to be held as a thing indifferent, and ought to be observed for the sake of fellowship with those among whom we live." He then goes on to describe his mother's perplexity when she first came to Milan and found that the Church there did not fast on Saturday ; and gives the advice of S. Ambrose, which, he says, " I have always esteemed, as if I had received it by an oracle from heaven " : " When I visit Rome I fast on Saturday ; when I am here I do not fast. On the same principle, do you observe the custom prevailing in whatever Church you come to, if you desire neither to give offence by your conduct nor to find cause of offence in another's." ¹

Rather later than this the ecclesiastical historian Socrates set himself to catalogue as far as possible " the diversity of customs in the Churches," with regard not only to the Lenten fast, but also to the great " variation in the services performed in church," and other matters ; remarking in conclusion that " it would be difficult, if not impossible, to give a complete catalogue of all the various customs and ceremonial observances in use throughout every city and country." ²

Lastly, in answer to the question of Augustine of Canterbury, " Whereas the faith is one and the same, are there different customs in different Churches, and is one custom of Masses observed in the holy Roman Church and another in the Gallican Church ? " Pope Gregory the Great replied as follows : " You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman Church, in which you remember you

¹ *Ad inquisitiones Januarii*, Ep. liv.

² Socrates, *H. E.* V. c. xxii.

were bred up. But it pleases me, that if you have found anything either in the Roman or in the Gallican or in any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the Church of the English, which is as yet new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose, therefore, from each Church those things that are pious, religious, and correct, and when you have, as it were, made them up into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto.”¹

It is clear from these citations that the English Church is in complete harmony with the Church of earlier days when she not only asserts that “the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies,” but further maintains that “every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.”²

¹ Bæda, *H. E. I. c. xxvii.*

² The theory, as stated in the Article, is perfectly clear, and represents the position from which the Church has never swerved. It is to *the Church*, not to the civil power, Parliament or Crown, that this “power” belongs. But in a Church by law established, it cannot be denied that there are grave practical difficulties in the way of exercising it. The Book of Common Prayer having been actually attached to an Act of Parliament, of which it forms a part, it is plain that, as a matter of fact, it cannot be in any way altered without the consent of that authority which gave coercive power to enforce its use. But it is equally clear that this authority, viz. Parliament, has no sort of moral right to attempt to alter it, except at the wish of the Church which first prepared and accepted it, and then presented it to Parliament to be attached to the Act of Uniformity; and the constitutional method of proceeding in the case of any “rites or ceremonies” to be decreed, is very clearly laid down in “the Royal Declaration” still prefixed to the Articles. “If any difference arise about the external policy concerning the *Injunctions, Canons*, and other *Constitutions* whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their Convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under

II. *The judicial Authority of the Church with regard to Doctrine.*

The Church . . . hath authority in controversies of faith.

(a) This "authority" is altogether distinct in kind from the "power" which has just been considered. The "power" is *legislative*, and includes the right to make new ceremonies, to change and abolish old ones. The "authority" is *judicial*. It is the right not to make a single new Article of faith, but simply *authority in a doctrinal controversy to pronounce what the true doctrine is.*¹ And since, in the words of Article VI., "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation," it is clear that the words mean that to the Church belongs the function of interpreting the Scripture, and deciding what the true meaning of it may be. This is strictly "judicial" authority, analogous to the power vested in the judges of interpreting the laws of the country. While the laws are made by the Crown with assent of Parliament, yet, when once a law has been placed on the Statute Book, Parliament has no power whatever to say what it means. Indeed, the legislators may have intended one thing, but if they have our Broad Seal so to do; and we approving their said Ordinances and Constitutions, providing that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land."

¹ Cf. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V. c. viii. § 2: "The Church hath authority to establish that for an order at one time which at another time it may abolish, and in both may do well. But that which in doctrine the Church doth now deliver as a truth, no man will say that it may hereafter recall, and as rightly avouch the contrary. Laws touching matter of order are changeable by the power of the Church; Articles concerning doctrine not so."

expressed their meaning badly, it may turn out that they have passed something quite different, for to the judges alone belongs the power of interpreting the words of the statute and saying what they really involve. Just so, in the matter of necessary doctrine, the laws, so to speak, are contained in the written Scriptures; but, as human language is never quite free from ambiguity, an interpreter of them is required, and this is provided for us in "the Church," which "hath authority in controversies of faith." Instances of the exercise of this judicial authority are to be found in the dogmatic decisions of the General Councils defining the faith of the Church; and no better example can be given to illustrate how the authority differs from the legislative power than what occurred at Nicæa. Two questions came before the assembled Fathers for decision: (1) the faith of the Church in our Lord's Divinity, and (2) the time for the celebration of the Easter festival. In regard to the former they simply claimed to lay down what the faith as contained in the Scriptures really was. They did not make a new doctrine. In regard to the latter, they laid down a new rule to govern the Church for the future. The distinction is pointed out by Athanasius himself in a well-known passage. "Without prefixing consulate, month, and day, they wrote concerning Easter: 'It seemed good as follows'; for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance in this matter. But concerning the faith they wrote not 'It seemed good,' but 'Thus the Catholic Church believes'; and thereupon they confessed how they believed, in order to show that their own sentiments were not novel but apostolical; and what they wrote down was no discovery of theirs, but the same as was taught by the apostles."¹

(b) That this authority belongs to the Church would

¹ Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 5.

seem to follow of necessity from many passages of Scripture. Unless the Church possesses it, it would be impossible for her to exercise properly the function of teaching which is distinctly laid upon her. She is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15). The power of "binding and loosing"¹ was granted to her by the Lord Himself (S. Matt. xviii. 18). It was exercised at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), when the question was raised whether circumcision was to be enforced upon Gentile converts, and the decision was arrived at under the guidance of the Holy Spirit ("it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," ver. 28) that there was no necessity for it. S. Paul charges Timothy to "hold the pattern of sound words" which he had received from him (2 Tim. i. 13); to "present himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth" (ii. 15); to "shun vain babblings"; to "charge others that they strive not about words, to no profit, to the subverting of them that hear them" (*ib.*); to "refuse ignorant and foolish questions" (ver. 23); to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and teaching, for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine" (iv. 2). To Titus he writes that the bishop is to "hold the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers" (i. 9); vain talkers are to be "reproved sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men" (ver. 13); he is to "shun foolish questionings and genealogies" (iii.

¹ J. Lightfoot (*Horæ Hebraicæ* on S. Matt. xvi. 19) shows very fully that to "bind" and "loose" were familiar Jewish expressions for to forbid and allow. It is perhaps scarcely necessary to add that this power, given first to S. Peter in xvi. 19, but extended to the Church generally in xviii. 18, is entirely different from the power of retaining and remitting sins given in S. John xx. 23.

10), and to "reject a man that is heretical after the first and second admonition" (*ib.*). All such language as this plainly implies a power of discrimination, and authority to judge and decide between the truth and falsehood. Unless the Church and her representatives possess such authority, who is to say what is "the sound doctrine" which is to be taught? or who can tell which is "the man that is heretical," and which the man that is orthodox?

(c) It was shown above that the "power to decree rites or ceremonies" might be exercised by national Churches, and that it is not necessary that ceremonies should be everywhere the same. With regard to this "authority in controversies of faith," the case is obviously different. Although "particular and national Churches" have frequently exercised this authority, yet it has always been subject to the judgment of the whole Church, and liable to revision by this. To the whole Church it is that the presence of Christ is pledged (S. Matt. xxviii. 19); and to this alone is the promise made that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (S. Matt. xvi. 18). Thus, while on various matters of doctrine the decision was made by local or provincial Councils, before ever the whole Church had an opportunity of expressing her mind,¹ yet only so far as these local decisions have subsequently been found to be in accordance with the mind of the universal Church have

¹ Thus the Council of Constantinople (381), which condemned Apollinarianism and Macedonianism, was not apparently summoned as a *General* one, but has only come to be so regarded in consequence of its subsequent acceptance by the whole Church. *Local* Councils were naturally summoned to condemn Montanism (Eusebius; *H. E.* V. xvi.); for in the second century no others were possible. But even after the age of General Councils had begun, local ones frequently considered and decided on doctrinal questions, *e.g.*, in the case of Pelagianism, it was at once condemned by the Council of Carthage, 412.

they been regarded as binding. In the present unhappy and abnormal state of a divided Christendom it is, of course, impossible to obtain a judgment from the *whole* Church on any matter in dispute; but it must always be remembered that while the English Reformers in the sixteenth century claimed and exercised this "authority," as is shown by the promulgation of the Articles, yet they did this *subject to their appeal to a free General Council*, which Cranmer and his colleagues never entirely lost sight of.¹

(d) But this "authority in controversies of faith" which belongs to the Church is not unlimited; and just as the Article stated two constitutional checks on the legislative power, so also it lays down two definite limitations to the judicial power.²

(1) The Church may not so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.

(2) Besides the same (Holy Scripture), ought it

¹ See Cranmer's "Remains" (Parker Society), i. pp. 224 and 455.

² The following arrangement of the Article will show the bearing of the several clauses, the exact force of which is often missed, and (so far as I am aware) not noticed in any of the commentaries on the Articles:—

The Legislative Power.

The Judicial Authority.

The Church hath

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) power to decree rites and ceremonies, and | (2) authority in controversies of faith. |
|---|--|

And yet it is not lawful for the Church

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1a) to ordain anything contrary to God's word written; | (2a) neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. |
|---|--|

Wherefore

although the Church be a witness and a keeper
of Holy Writ,
yet as

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1b) it ought not to decree anything against the same, so | (2b) besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation. |
|---|---|

not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

These limitations follow naturally from the position claimed for Holy Scripture in Article VI., and would seem to require no further comment or illustration here.

(e) But there are difficult questions which it is possible to raise concerning the exercise of the authority thus limited, which it may be well briefly to consider. Who is to decide whether the Church has exceeded the powers thus conceded to her? And what is to be done if it should appear that as a matter of fact she has exceeded them? On these points the Article is silent. They raise the whole subject of the relation of Church authority to private judgment. Obviously there is no other body or society on earth with the right of reviewing the judgments of the Church and pronouncing upon them. But still the case may occur when it appears to some individuals, perhaps only to a very few, that the judgment of the Church is wrong. To say that it is an impossibility that God would allow His Church thus to err, is to be untrue to the whole teaching of history. There was a time when "the world groaned and found itself Arian," and when Athanasius stood *contra mundum*; and what has occurred once may occur again. With our eyes, then, open to the teaching of history, we cannot insist that a man *must* bow to the judgment of the Church. He is not called on to accept as truth that which his deliberate conviction tells him is false. While he will rightly and naturally give the greatest weight to the judgment thus expressed, feeling that it is far more probable that he should be mistaken than that the whole Church should be wrong, yet in the last resort he himself must be the judge. He must be true to his conscientious and candid convictions. The right of

private judgment is inalienable. He cannot divest himself of it.¹ "To his own master he standeth or falleth." He will feel in his inmost heart with Liberius before his fall, when taunted with the fact that he was the sole Western champion of the Catholic faith, that "the cause of the faith is none the worse because he happens to be left alone,"² and "with a sorrowful heart" will "refer all to God."³ And, if the future may be prophesied from the past, it will always be found that the error is of no long duration, and that the truth which has been kept alive by the few faithful ones in a period of general falling away, will presently be accepted by the Church at large, and recognised as "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints."

III. *The Office of the Church with regard to Holy Scripture.*

There is one clause of the Article on which nothing has yet been said, viz. that which states that **the Church is a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ.** A twofold office is here assigned to her. She is (*a*) a *witness*, as testifying to us what books are to be regarded as Scripture, for "in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical books of the Old Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church" (Article VI.), and also as declaring to us what is the meaning of Scripture; for, as we have already seen, she "hath authority in controversies of faith." Besides this, she is (*b*) a *keeper* of holy writ: for just as to the Jews of

¹ Cf. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 46 *seq.*

² Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. II. c. xvi.

³ Cf. William of Occam, *Dial.* Bk. V. par. i. c. 28. I owe this and the previous reference to *The Church Historical Society Lectures*, Series ii. p. 78, a valuable lecture on the "Teaching Power of the Church," by Professor W. E. Collins.

old "were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2), so now that there is a "New Testament" as well as an "Old," the completed Canon is to be regarded as a treasure committed to the custody of the Church, who is responsible for preserving it entire, and free from admixture with other books, as well as for transmitting it and proclaiming it to each generation in turn. It is in these ways that the Church fulfils her office as "a witness and a keeper of holy writ," and from what has now been said the respective offices of the Church and Holy Scripture may be clearly seen. The Church is the ordained *teacher* of truth; Holy Scripture is the *criterion* of truth by which the doctrines of the Church are proved and tested. To make Scripture, in the first instance, the teacher, is entirely to mistake its true office and function. The Gospels were written, not to convert unbelievers, but that those who had been already orally instructed (*i.e.* who had received the teaching of the Church) might know the certainty of those things which they had been taught.¹ So also the Epistles were addressed to regularly organised Churches, and were written to confirm those who had previously received apostolic teaching. Indeed, it is everywhere the case that "the Bible assumes the existence of a living instructor in the truth, who will indoctrinate us into the rudiments of it, and refer us to the Scriptures themselves for the proof of what he teaches. If the instructor is dispensed with, and the disciple thrown back merely on the Bible and his natural faculties, he will be very liable to stumble, and almost certain to do so as regards those more recondite definitions of doctrine which the Church's experience of heresies has shown her to be necessary, and has taught her to make."² These offices of "the

¹ See S. Luke i. 1-4.

² Goulbourn's *Holy Catholic Church*, p. 294.

Church to teach, the Bible to prove," may be illustrated from the incident recorded in Acts viii. 26-40. The Ethiopian eunuch was "sitting in his chariot, and was reading the prophet Isaiah." He was, then, in possession of the Scriptures, and, according to the rather foolish saying, "the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants," these ought to have been sufficient for him. But plainly they were not; for in answer to Philip's question, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" the answer is returned, "How can I, except someone should guide me?" and this is followed by the further question, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? Of himself, or of some other?" Something more was needed than the possession of the Scriptures, and that something was supplied by Philip, the representative of the *ecclesia docens*, who "opened his mouth, and beginning from this scripture preached unto him Jesus." Here we see the Church at work, and the right method to be followed, as it is seen throughout the Acts of the Apostles, where we everywhere find them stating the facts, and teaching with authority, while they prove their statements from the Scriptures, and refer their hearers to these as confirming them.¹ And if this method was employed when only the Old Testament was in existence, it seems natural to suppose that much more should it be followed now, when the fuller revelation is also committed to writing.²

¹ See Acts ii. 14-36, iii. 12-26, xiii. 16-42, xvii. 2, 3, 11, xviii. 28.

² See on this subject Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, c. iii. and iv.

ARTICLE XXI

De autoritate Conciliorum Generalium.

Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate principum congregari non possunt, et ubi convenerint, quia ex hominibus constant, qui non omnes spiritu et verbo Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt, etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent: ideo quæ ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent, neque auctoritatem, nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.

Of the authority of General Councils.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

SINCE the Forty-two Articles were first published in 1553 this Article has remained practically unchanged.¹ But *before publication* a clause had been wisely omitted from the close of it, which, as we find from the MS. signed by the six royal chaplains,² had stood in the original draft: "Possunt reges et pii magistratus, non expectata conciliorum generalium sententia aut convocatione, in

¹ In the *English* edition of 1553 "not only in worldly matters, but also" stood before "in things pertaining unto God." There was nothing corresponding to these words in the Latin, and they were accordingly omitted in 1563. In the Latin "verbis Dei" stood in 1553 and 1563, being altered to the singular "verbo" in 1571.

² *State Papers*, "Domestic," Edward VI. vol. xv. No. 23. Cf. vol. i. p. 14, and Hardwick, p. 283.

republica sua juxta Dei verbum de rebus religionis constituere." The gravest objection might have been taken to such a clause, and we may be thankful that it was withdrawn before the Articles were published.

Perhaps no Article gains more than this from being read in the light of the history of the time when it was drawn up, and from being illustrated by contemporary documents. Had we nothing but the bare letter of the Article itself to consider, it might be plausibly maintained that by saying that "General Councils have erred," it condemns those Councils which the whole Church has ever revered as truly general, and expressing her mind, such as Nicæa (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451). Nothing, however, is more certain than the fact that no such sweeping condemnation is intended, for contemporary with the Forty-two Articles, and drawn up to a great extent by the very same men who are responsible for them, is the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*;¹ and in this there is a remarkable section which runs parallel with the Article, amplifying its statements, and affording a practical exposition of it, and commentary upon its meaning. It runs as follows:—

"De conciliis quid sentiendum.

"Jam vero conciliis, potissimum generalibus, tametsi ingentem honorem libenter deferimus, ea tamen longe omnia infra Scripturarum canonicarum dignitatem ponenda judicamus: sed et inter ipsa concilia magnum discrimen ponimus. Nam quædam illorum, qualia sunt præcipua illa quatuor, Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum primum, Ephesinum, et Chalcedonense, magna cum reverentia amplectimur et suscipimus. Quod quidem judicium de

¹ See vol. i. p. 28 *seq.*

multis aliis quæ postea celebrata sunt ferimus, in quibus videmus et confitemur sanctissimos patres de beata et summa Trinitate, de Jesu Christo Domino et servatore nostro, et humana redemptione per eum procurata, juxta Scripturas divinas multa gravissime et perquam sancte constituisse. Quibus tamen non aliter fidem nostram obligandam esse censemus, nisi quatenus ex Scripturis sanctis confirmari possint. Nam concilia nonnulla interdum errasse, et contraria inter sese definivisse, partim in actionibus juris, partim etiam in fide, manifestum est. Itaque legantur concilia quidem cum honore atque Christiana reverentia, sed interim ad Scripturarum piam certam rectamque regulam examinentur.”¹

The Article must beyond question be interpreted by this longer statement. It is certain, therefore, that it does not intend to cast any slur upon those Councils which are received “magna cum reverentia,” but that it uses the term “General Councils” in a loose and popular way, of Councils which claimed to be “general,” as well as of those which are truly representative of the mind of the whole Church. The necessity for such an Article is seen in the circumstances of the time. From the early days of Luther, the Reformers, both on the Continent and in England, had persistently appealed to a free General Council, and finally the Pope (Paul III.) had been driven, in 1545, to summon a “General Council.” But (1) it was called by the Pope alone, who claimed the right to cite to it, in person or by proxy, the king of England among other Christian princes;² and (2) it consisted only of bishops of the Roman obedience. It was therefore not such a Council as the Reformers could regard as truly “general,” or feel themselves compelled

¹ *Ref. Legum Eccles.*, De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, c. xiv.

² Cf. Dixon's *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. p. 425.

to accept. But in view of the fact that it was actually being held when the Articles were drawn up, and that its decrees were certain to be appealed to as authoritative by the opponents of the Reformation, it was important that in the Anglican formulary a statement should be found, asserting, in terms such as would justify a refusal to be bound by the decisions of Trent, the abstract position maintained with regard to "the authority of General Councils."

Three principal statements are made concerning them—

1. They may not be gathered together without the consent of princes.
2. They are liable to err.
3. As a matter of history they actually have erred.

I. *They may not be gathered together without the consent of Princes.*

General Councils may not (non possunt) **be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes.** It is sometimes inferred from the Latin "non possunt" that what is here meant is that as a matter of fact they *cannot* be so gathered together. This appears doubtful, for it is more probable that "non possunt" means "cannot lawfully," i.e. "may not."¹ But, however this may be, either statement is true, for princes alone have it in their power to compel or to prohibit the attendance of their subjects, and therefore obviously have the right not only to be consulted as a matter of courtesy, but also to say

¹ Cf. Article XX., where "nec exponere *potest*" is equivalent to "neither *may* it so expound," and XXXVII., where "Leges civiles *possunt*," etc. can only mean as the English renders it, "the laws of the realm *may* punish," etc.

whether a Council shall or shall not be held.¹ As a matter of history there is no question that all the early General Councils were summoned by the Emperor and not by the Pope.² Indeed, the idea of a General Council seems to have originated, not with the Church, but with the Emperor;³ and although, after the decline of the Empire and the division of Europe into several kingdoms, since there was no longer any one supreme power, capable of commanding and enforcing the attendance of bishops from various countries, it was natural that the Pope, whose power was steadily growing, should not only preside at the Council when summoned, but actually issue the invitations to it; yet it stands to reason that even so this could only be properly done with "the consent of princes."⁴

¹ As a matter of fact, even so late as 1870 the various Governments of modern Europe played an important part in determining whether or no the "Vatican Council" should be held. See Purcell's *Life of Archbishop Manning*, vol. ii. c. xvi.

² That of Nicea by Constantine I.; Constantinople by Theodosius I.; Ephesus by Theodosius II.; Chalcedon, at the request and instigation of Pope Leo I., by Marcian. So the second Council of Constantinople (553) was summoned by the Emperor Justinian, and the third (680) by Constantine Pogonatus; so also the Synod of Nicea (787), regarded by both the Greeks and Latins as the seventh General Council, was summoned by the Empress Irene. Thus every Council which has any fair claim to represent the undivided Church was called together "with the commandment and will of princes."

³ "The conception of a General Council did not give rise to Nicea, but *vice versa*," Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. lxxv., and there can be little doubt that the idea of the Council was due to Constantine himself. Cf. *Church Historical Lectures*, Series 2, p. 164.

⁴ So early as 1533 the question was raised in England in consequence of Henry VIII.'s appeal from the Pope to a General Council, and a declaration was put forth signed by nine bishops and four other divines to the effect that though in old times Councils were "called and gathered together by the Emperor's commandment. . . . Yet now, forasmuch that the empire of Rome and the monarchy of the same has no such general dominion, but that many princes have absolute power in their own realms, and a whole entire monarchy, no other prince may by his authority call a General

II. *General Councils are liable to err.*

When they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God) they may err. On this matter the verdict of history is conclusive. Had we not the experience of the past to teach us, it might have seemed, *a priori*, probable that God would not have allowed a body that is summoned as representative of the whole Church to err. But as it is, there can be no question on the subject. The record of Councils, summoned as "General" ones and conducted with proper forms, is often a painful one to read; and the exhibitions of human passion and prejudice sometimes exhibited in them have certainly shown that all their members are not necessarily "governed by the spirit of God." Moreover, they have always been treated by the Church as liable to err,¹ for many of them have been reviewed by later Councils, and sometimes their verdicts have been reversed.²

Council" (Collier, *Records*, xxxviii.). Three years later a more authoritative "judgment concerning General Councils" was put forth by Convocation, in which the divines of both houses gave their opinion that "neither the Bishop of Rome ne any one prince, of what estate, degree, or pre-eminence soever he be, may, by his own authority, call, indict, or summon any General Council, without the express consent, assent, and agreement of the residue of Christian princes, and especially such as have within their own realms and seignories *imperium merum*, that is to say, of such as have the whole, entire, and supreme government and authority over all their subjects, without knowledging or recognising of any other supreme power or authority," Burnet, I. ii. p. 301 *seq.*

¹ See the letter of Pope Julius in Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, § 20-25. In this Julius says that it is unreasonable that what has been established by Councils should be set aside by "a few individuals," but treats the decision of Councils as liable to be reviewed by others, referring to the Council of Nicæa as having decided that this should be done (see Robertson's note, *in loc.* and p. lxxvi.).

² Thus the "Latrocinium" was summoned as a General Council, but its decisions were reversed by the Council of Chalcedon, 451. So also in

Thus the Article is perfectly justified, not only in its *second* statement, but also in its *third*.

III. *As a matter of History, General Councils have erred.*

That they **sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God** (etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent), is a matter which can easily be shown when it is remembered that the Article is referring to any Councils which claimed to be General. Thus Ariminum and Seleucia were summoned as General Councils representative of the whole Christian world, but they went fatally wrong "even in things pertaining to God." The same is true of many later Councils; and if the position taken up in Articles VI. and XX. with regard to Holy Scripture is sound, there can be no doubt that the closing words of the Article now under consideration are justified, and that **things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.**

The language of the Article itself and all that has here been said in the commentary upon it, is, of course, only *one side* of the whole truth about Councils, and that the least pleasant to dwell upon. It must never be forgotten that there is another side, and that the Church owes very much to the work of Councils which were truly "General" and representative. Nor has the Church of England been slow to acknowledge this. The language of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* has

the Iconoclastic Controversy, the seventh Council of Constantinople (754) condemned image-worship; but its decrees were reversed by the second Council of Nicaea, which sanctioned the practice in 787. Frankfort (794) condemned the practice, but the eighth of Constantinople (869) sanctioned it.

been already cited. The Homily "Against peril of Idolatry" speaks of the six Councils which were allowed and received of all men; and it may be added that by an Act of Parliament passed in the first year of Elizabeth's reign it was determined that "nothing is to be adjudged heresy, but that which heretofore has been so adjudged by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or the first four General Councils, or some other General Council, wherein the same has been declared heresy by the express word of Scripture."¹

The question remains, How is it to be known whether a Council is truly "General" and representative of the mind of the whole Church? To this it is believed that no answer can be returned *at the moment*. However large may be the number of the bishops present, no guarantee is thereby afforded that they faithfully represent the mind of the universal Church. That which alone can show this, is the *after-reception of the decisions of the Council by the different parts of the Church*. Where the decisions win their way to universal acceptance, there we have the needful guarantee that the Council has faithfully reflected the mind of the universal Church, and we may well be content to believe that the Council has not erred. But "the inerrancy of a Council can never be guaranteed at the moment. The test of the value of a Council is its after-reception by the Church."²

¹ 1 Eliz. cap. 1. Some Anglican divines, as Hooker and Andrews, seem to recognise but *four* General Councils; others, as Field and Hammond, recognise *six*. See Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, part IV. c. ix.

² Bishop Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 298. On this, which is sometimes called the Gallican theory of the test of the authority of General Councils, see Sir W. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, part IV. c. vii.; R. L. Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, vol. i. p. 321 seq.; and *Church Historical Society Lectures*, series 2, p. 147 seq.

ARTICLE XXII

De Purgatorio.

Doctrina Romanensium de Purgatorio, de indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione tum imaginum tum reliquiarum, nec non de invocatione sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur, imo verbo Dei¹ contradicit.

Of Purgatory.

The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.

THIS Article differs in one important point from the original one as first published in 1553, for in that the teaching condemned was termed "the doctrine of school-authors" (*doctrina scholasticorum*). The effect of the substitution of "the Romish doctrine" (*doctrina Romanensium*) for this is to make the Article condemn a *present* current form of teaching rather than the formal system of doctors whose day was past.²

There is another matter in the history of the Article which deserves to be noticed, viz. that in the Article as originally drafted was included a condemnation of the scholastic doctrine *de precatone pro defunctis*. These words are found in the MS. signed by the six royal chaplains,³

¹ The edition of 1553 has "perniciose contradicit"; but the adverb was struck out in 1563, there being nothing corresponding to it in the English Article.

² "The words 'Romanenses' and 'Romanistæ' were already used as far back as 1520 by Luther and Ulrich von Hutten, to designate the extreme mediæval party."—Hardwick, p. 410.

³ See above, p. 529, and vol. i. p. 13.

but they disappeared before the Article was published,—a fact which is highly significant, as it shows that the Church of England deliberately abstained from seeming to express any condemnation of the practice of praying for the departed, and that it is impossible to strain the words of this Article on Purgatory to indicate such a condemnation.¹

With regard to the doctrines here condemned, it is important to bear in mind that when the Article was originally drawn up, and even when it was revised and republished in 1563, none of them had been considered by the Council of Trent. The Article cannot, then, have been deliberately aimed at the formal decrees of that Council; and, as a matter of fact, the decrees on these particular subjects, which were published during the last session of the Council in December 1563, were drawn up with studied moderation, and some of the strong language of our Article could hardly be truthfully said to apply to the doctrine as stated in them, though it certainly was not one whit too strong in its condemnation of the current practice and teaching which the Reformers had before them. It will be convenient at this point to quote so much of the Tridentine decree as bears on the subject before us, as the language used in it bears striking testimony to the existence of the errors which called forth the vigorous protest of our own Reformers.

On *Purgatory* the decree simply lays down that “there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there retained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.” It then proceeds: “Among the uneducated vulgar, let the more difficult and subtle questions, and those which tend not to edifi-

¹ It follows from this that the subject of prayer for the departed does not come before us for consideration here. Reference may, however, be made to an article on “the Church of England and Prayers for the Departed” in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. x. p. 1.

cation, and seldom contribute aught towards piety, be kept back from popular discourses. Neither let them suffer the public mention and treatment of uncertain points, or such as look like falsehood. But those things which tend to a certain kind of curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, let them prohibit as scandals and stumbling-blocks of the faithful.”¹

With regard to *Pardons*, it was stated that as the power of granting indulgences was granted by Christ to His Church, the use of them was to be retained; and those were to be anathematised who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. “In granting them, however, it desires that, according to the ancient and approved custom in the Church, moderation be observed, lest by excessive facility ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And desiring the amendment and correction of the abuses which have crept into these matters, and by occasion of which this excellent name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, it ordains generally by this decree, that all evil gains for the obtaining of them, whence a most abundant cause of abuses among Christian people has been derived, be utterly abolished. But as regards other matters which have proceeded from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or from any other cause,

¹ “Cum Catholica Ecclesia . . . docuerit Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari; præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis ut sanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, a sanctis Patribus et sacris Conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari, diligenter studeant. Apud rudem vero plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quæstiones, quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, a popularibus concionibus secludantur. Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari, ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero, quæ ad curiositatem quamdam, aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiant, tanquam scandala, et fidelium offendicula prohibeant.”—*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xxv., *Decretum de Purgatorio*.

since, by reason of the manifold corruptions in the places and provinces where the said abuses are committed, they cannot conveniently be specially prohibited : it commands all bishops diligently to collect all abuses of this nature, and report them in the first provincial synod," etc.¹

On the *adoration of images and relics* it says that due honour and veneration is to be awarded to the images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the saints, "not that any virtue or divinity is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped ; or that anything is to be asked of them ; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was done of old by the heathen, who placed their hope in idols ; but because the honour which is shown to them is referred to the prototypes which they represent ; so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whose similitude they bear. . . . And if any abuses have crept in amongst these holy and salutary observances, the holy

¹ "Cum potestas conferendi Indulgentias a Christo ecclesie concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate, divinitus sibi tradita, antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit ; sacrosancta Synodus indulgentiarum usum, Christiano populo maxime salutarem et sacrorum Conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in ecclesia retinendum esse docet, et præcipit, eosque anathemate damnat, qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem et probatam in ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit ; ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur. Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, quorum occasione insigne hoc Indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, præsentî decreto generaliter statuit pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano populo abusu causa fluxit, omnino obolendos esse. Cæteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodo-cumque provenerunt, cum ob multiplices locorum et provinciarum, apud quas hi committuntur, corruptelas commode nequeant specialiter prohiberi ; mandat omnibus Episcopis, ut diligenter quisque hujusmodi abusus ecclesie sue colligat, eosque in prima synodo provinciali referat," etc.—*Continuatio Sessionis xxv., Decretum de Indulgentiis.*

Synod earnestly desires that they be utterly abolished : in such wise that no images conducive to false doctrine, and furnishing occasion of dangerous error to the uneducated, be set up. . . . Moreover, in the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and the sacred use of images, every superstition shall be removed, all filthy lucre be abolished, finally all lasciviousness be avoided ; in such wise that figures shall not be painted or adorned with a wantonness of beauty, nor shall men pervert the celebration of the saints and the visitation of relics into revellings and drunkenness ; as if festivals were celebrated to the honour of saints by luxury and wantonness.”¹

So on the subject of *invocation of saints* the Council enjoins that the people be taught “ that the saints reigning with Christ offer their prayers for men to God, and that it is good and useful to invoke them as suppliants, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour ; and that

¹ “Imaginibus Christi, Deiparæ Virginis, et aliorum sanctorum in templis præsertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis Divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ ; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum ; vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant ; sed quoniam honos qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quæ ille repræsentant : ita ut per imagines quæ osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus et procumbimus, Christum adoremus, et sanctos, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt veneremur. . . . In has autem sanctas et salutare observationes, si qui abusus irreperint, eos prorsus aboleri sancta Synodus vehementer cupit, ita ut nullæ falsi dogmatis imagines, et rudibus periculosi erroris occasione præbentes, statuuntur. . . . Omnis porro superstitio in sanctorum invocatione, Reliquiarum veneratione, et imaginum sacro usu tollatur, omnis turpis quæstus eliminetur, omnis denique lascivia vitetur, ita ut procaci venustate imagines non pingantur, nec ornentur, et sanctorum celebratione, et reliquiarum visitatione homines ad comessationes atque ebrietates non abutantur, quasi festi dies in honorem sanctorum per luxum, ac lasciviam agantur.”—Sess. xxv. *De Invocatione, etc.*

they think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the word of God, and is opposed to the honour of the one Mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus; or that it is a fond thing to supplicate orally or inwardly those who reign in heaven.”¹

It is impossible to read these extracts without feeling how gross must have been the abuses which called forth such language, and it would be unfair to neglect to take into account the fact that our own Article was drawn up prior to these definitions and the practical reforms which the Council of Trent endeavoured to bring about. We proceed now to the consideration of the “Romish doctrines” condemned in the Article. Four of them are specified.

1. Purgatory.
2. Pardons.
3. Adoration of images and relics.
4. Invocation of saints.

I. Purgatory.

The Romish doctrine of Purgatory . . . is a

¹ . . . “Docentes eos, sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre: bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare, et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor, et Salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere: illos vero, qui negant sanctos æterna felicitate in cœlo fruantes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idolatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi; vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire,” etc.—*Ib.*

fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God. It will be convenient to consider this subject under the two following heads: (a) the history of the doctrine; (b) the scriptural arguments on the subject.

(a) *The History of the Doctrine.*—During the first three centuries there are only to be found a few traces of a belief in anything like a purgatory between death and judgment. Three indications of such a belief are all that can fairly be claimed during this period, two of which come to us from the same quarter and from a Montanistic source.

Tertullian in his treatise *De Anima*, written after he had joined the Montanists, says that in Hades (penes inferos) there are rewards and punishments, as may be learnt from the parable of Dives and Lazarus; and as he interprets the words, "Thou shalt not come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing," to mean that "small offences must be expiated by delay of resurrection," it is probable that he looked on the punishments as, at any rate, to some extent purgatorial.¹

To the same period belong the Acts of the martyr Perpetua and her companions, and in one of Perpetua's visions we have what is generally taken to be an indication of a belief in something like a purgatory. Perpetua in her vision sees her brother Dinocrates, who had died early from a gangrene in the face, in a dark place, hot and thirsty, dirty and pale, with the wound still in his face. He is trying in vain to get at the

¹ *De Anima*, c. lviii.: "In summa, cum carcerem illum, quem evangelium demonstrat, inferos intellegimus, et novissimum quadrantem modicum quoque delictum mora resurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur, nemo dubitabit animam aliquid pensare penes inferos salva resurrectionis plenitudine per carnem quoque." Cf. c. xxxv.

water in a "piscina," the rim of which is above his head. Perpetua, grieving for her brother, prays much for him, and in a subsequent vision she sees him cleansed, well clothed, and refreshed. Only the scar remains where the wound was. The rim of the piscina is lowered to his waist; he drinks out of a golden goblet that never fails, and departs to play after the manner of children with glee. "Then," she adds, "I understood that he was released from punishment."¹

This certainly looks very much like a belief in a purgatory, and it is so understood by Augustine.² But this interpretation of the vision is not unquestioned, as some take it to mean that Dinocrates had died unbaptized, and was therefore in a place of torment.³ If, however, we admit what appears the more probable view, that it *does* refer to a purgatory, a vision such as this must be allowed to be a very precarious ground on which to base the doctrine.

The third passage is in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (200), where, in speaking of Hades, he says that "the punishments of God are saving and reformatory, and lead to repentance."⁴

Beyond these it is thought that no passage can fairly be quoted as implying a belief in a purgatory between death and judgment till we come to the fourth century. For though Origen undoubtedly believed in temporary chastisements after death, and in a cleansing by fire, yet this does not seem to have been placed by him *before* the judgment. Rather, it *is* the judgment, through which men have to pass, and by which those in need of

¹ *Passio S. Perpetuae*, cs. vii. viii.

² *De Anima ad Renatum*, I. x.

³ It is so taken by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, I. p. 29.

⁴ *Stromateis*, VI. c. vi. § 46: ἐπεὶ σωτήριοι καὶ παιδευτικοὶ αἱ κολάσεις τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἐπιστροφήν ἀγούσαι.

purification are at once both chastened and healed.¹ But there can be no doubt, (1) that the whole Church from the very first practised and encouraged prayers for the departed; and (2) that the judgment day was commonly regarded as a fiery ordeal, such as that spoken of by S. Paul in 1 Cor. iii. 13, through which all would have to pass, some passing through the fire unharmed, others suffering loss, but none failing who were built on the right foundation. This, however, is very different from purgatory. Not only is it placed at the judgment, whereas the purgatorial fire is regarded as cleansing those subjected to it *before* the final award is made at the judgment day, but, further, it is an ordeal through which *all*, the greatest saints and the greatest sinners, will have to pass, while purgatory is not for the saints, who are supposed to pass straight to the beatific vision, nor for those who die out of a state of grace, whose final condemnation is assured, but only for those who die in grace, but in a state of imperfect sanctification.

Nor does prayer for the departed by any means involve of necessity a belief in purgatory. Indeed, many of the prayers of the early Christians are quite inconsistent with it, for they include petitions for the Blessed Virgin and other great saints, whom no one would venture to maintain were in purgatory.

Passing on to the fourth century we still find but few traces of a belief in the doctrine in question, nor is there anything authoritative laid down concerning it. Indeed, the hesitating and varying language employed by S. Augustine early in the fifth century shows clearly that he did not regard it as a formal doctrine of the Church, but only at best as a "pious opinion." Thus in his *Encheiridion*, published in 416, he speaks of it as "not

¹ See Bp. Westcott in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. p. 138.

incredible.”¹ But in his great work, *De Civitate Dei*, issued a few years later (426), he speaks more strongly in favour of it, though even here his language is not altogether consistent. In Book XXI. c. xiii., after speaking of the opinion of some who “would have all punishments after death to be purgatorial,” he says definitely that “temporary punishments are suffered by some in this life only, by others after death, by others both now and then; but all of them before the last and strictest judgment. But of those who suffer temporary punishments after death, all are not doomed to those everlasting pains which are to follow that judgment; for to some, as we have already said, what is not remitted in this world is remitted in the next, that is, they are not punished with the eternal judgment of the world to come.”² But after speaking thus positively he elsewhere utters a note of hesitation on the subject, for in c. xxvi. of the same book he writes as follows: “If it be said that in the interval of time between the death of this body and that last day of judgment and retribution which shall follow the resurrection, the spirits of the dead shall be exposed to a fire of such a nature that it shall not affect those who have not in this life indulged in such pleasures and pursuits as shall be consumed like wood, hay, stubble, but shall affect those others who have carried with them structures of that kind—if it be said that such worldliness, being venial, shall be consumed in the fire of tribulation here

¹ *Encheiridion ad Laurent.* c. lxix.

² “Sed temporarias pœnas alii in hac vita tantum, alii post mortem, alii et nunc et tunc, verumtamen ante iudicium illud severissimum novissimumque patiuntur. Non autem omnes veniunt in sempiternas pœnas, quæ post illud iudicium sunt futuræ, qui post mortem sustinent temporales. Nam quibusdam, quodin isto non remittitur, remitti in futuro sæculo, id est, ne futuri sæculi æterno supplicio puniantur, jam supra diximus.”—*De Civitate Dei*, XXI. c. xiii.

only, or here and hereafter both, or here that it may not be hereafter, I do not argue against it, for perhaps it is true.”¹ Plainly there was no formal doctrine of the Church on the subject when a Father of the weight and learning of Augustine could write in this way; and not till a century and a half after his death do we find anything approaching to an assertion with any claim to authority. At the close of the sixth century Gregory the Great, in his “Dialogues,” lays down distinctly that “a purgatorial fire before the judgment for lighter faults is to be believed.”² But even so this is only a passing statement by a single writer, however great his authority, and it would seem that there is nothing which can be regarded as in any way a judgment of the Church upon the subject till we come to the Council of Florence in 1439. At this Council the representatives of the Greeks were persuaded to admit that “the middle sort of souls were in a place of torment, but whether that were fire or darkness and tempest, or something else, they would not contend,”³ and accordingly, when the decree of union was drawn up, it was asserted in it that “if such as be truly penitent die in the grace of God before they have made satisfaction for their sins by

¹ “Post istius sane corporis mortem, donec ad illum veniatur, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicuntur perpeti, quem non sentiant illi qui non habuerunt tales mores et amores in hujus corporis vita, ut eorum ligna, fœnum, stipula consumatur, alii vero sentiant qui ejusmodi secum ædificia portaverunt, sive ibi tantum, sive et hic et ibi, sive ideo hic ut non ibi, sæcularia, quamvis a damnatione venalia, concremantem ignem transitorie tribulationis invenient, non redarguo, quia forsitan verum est.”—*Op. cit.* c. xxvi.

² “Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est. Sed tamen hoc de parvis minimisque peccatis fieri posse credendum est; sicut est assiduus otiosus sermo, immoderatus risus,” etc.—*Dial.* IV. c. xxxix.

³ “Αἱ δὲ μέσαι ὑπάρχουσι μὲν ἐν βασανιστηρίῳ καὶ εἶτε πῦρ ἐστὶν, εἶτε ζόφος καὶ θύελλα, εἶτε τι ἕτερον, οὐ διαφερόμεθα.—*Concil. Florent.* Sess. xxv.

worthy fruits of penance, their souls are purged after death with purgatorial punishments.”¹ But long before this decree was issued the doctrine had been universally accepted throughout the West, and had assumed a prominence which led to the gravest practical results. The original teaching had been strangely and terribly corrupted. “It had come to take the place of a living faith in the eternal pains of hell in the case of most men: there was a perfect traffic in masses for the souls, and men fancied that by leaving money to the Church at the hour of death and at the expense of their heirs, they might purchase mitigation or exemption from pains which in degree, though not in duration, were said to equal the pains of hell.”² It is, unhappily, only too easy to illustrate the truth of these words from known and admitted facts of history and from documents which were before those who drew up our Articles; but since the existence of such abuses in connection with the doctrine is so universally acknowledged, there is no need to cite evidence of it here.

(b) *The Scriptural arguments on the subject.*—It is now generally admitted by Roman Catholic writers that

¹ “Si vere poenitentes in Dei charitate decesserint, antequam dignis poenitentiae fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animas poenis purgatoriis post mortem purgari.”—Eugenii IV. *Bulla Unionis*, Labbe and Cossart, vol. vii. p. 422. On the Council of Florence see Plumptre’s *Spirits in Prison*, p. 296 seq., and Creighton’s *History of the Papacy*, vol. ii. p. 179 seq. It is well known how the representatives of the Greeks were received on their return to Constantinople, and how the decrees were rejected throughout the East. But in spite of this the Greek Church of the present day, though not *formally* committed to a doctrine of purgatory, and while guarding itself against the notion of a *material* fire, appears generally to teach that there is a process of purification after death, and that the souls of the departed profit by the Eucharists, prayers, and alms of the living, and are thereby freed from the bonds of Hades. See Plumptre, *l.c.*, and Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 312.

² Bp. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 309.

there is but little in Holy Scripture which can be quoted as bearing directly upon the doctrine. Of the "twenty passages" of which Bellarmine boasts,¹ there are very few which any controversialist would venture to cite at the present day. Indeed, some of them are so weak (*e.g.* "We went through *fire* and water, and Thou broughtest out into a wealthy place") that they only indicate into what desperate straits the man who could urge them as serious arguments was driven in order to find any scriptural proof whatever. It is not too much to say that, when once it is recognised that prayer for the departed does not necessarily involve any belief in purgatory,² there are not more than three or four passages which require any consideration whatever.

The following are perhaps the most important, and are sometimes quoted at the present day, as implying a terminable punishment, which is said to be purgatorial only, after death:—

S. Matt. v. 26: "Thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the last farthing." Cf. S. Luke xii. 59.

S. Matt. xviii. 34: "His lord delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due. So likewise shall also my heavenly Father do unto you," etc.

S. Matt. xii. 32: "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come."

¹ *De Purgatorio*, I. c. xv. The twenty passages are these,—ten from the Old Testament and ten from the New Testament,—2 Macc. xii. 44; Tobit iv. 17; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13; Ps. xxxviii. 1, lvi. 12; Is. iv. 4, ix. 18; Mic. vii. 8, 9; Zech. ix. 11; Mal. iii. 3; S. Matt. xii. 32; 1 Cor. iii. 12–15, xv. 29; S. Matt. v. 25, 26, v. 22; S. Luke xvi. 9, xxiii. 43; Acts ii. 24; Phil. ii. 10; Rev. v. 3. See the discussion of them in *op. cit.* c. iii.–viii.

² 2 Macc. xii. 44 certainly shows the belief of the ancient Jews in the efficacy of prayer for the departed in the first or second century B.C.

In the case of the first two passages cited, it is urged that they place a term to the punishment, and therefore imply a purgatory from which men will at some time be delivered. But such an inference is extremely precarious, and those who rely on it would probably be the last to apply a similar method of arguing to the parallel phrase in S. Matt. i. 25. The exegesis of S. Chrysostom is surely sound, which takes it as a form of expression intended to indicate the perpetual duration of the penalty, *τούτεστι διηνέκως, οὐδέπω γὰρ ἀποδώσει*.¹ While in the case of the third passage, the form of expression is evidently intended as an emphatic way of stating the irremediableness of the condition, and there is nothing in it to warrant the inference that some sins are forgiven in the world to come which are not forgiven in this world.²

There remains the passage in 1 Cor. iii. 10–15; and this, if carefully considered, will be seen to have no bearing whatever on the doctrine. It stands as follows in the Revised Version:—

“According to the grace of God which was given unto me, as a wise master-builder I laid a foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. But if any man buildeth on this foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble, each man’s work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work shall abide, which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward.

¹ *Hom. in loc.* Cf. Augustine, “Miror si non eam significat poenam quæ vocatur æterna.”—*De Sermone Domini in Monte*, I. xi.

² See Salmond’s *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 380, for a good statement of this.

If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss : but he himself shall be saved ; yet so as through fire."

It is probable that it is from this passage, more than from any other, that the idea of a purgatorial *fire* has arisen. But, as a matter of fact, whatever the passage may mean,—and there are different interpretations of it which are possible,—the one thing it cannot refer to is a purgatory between death and judgment. According to the Apostle, it is "the day" which "is to be revealed in fire" (*ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται*), and such an expression is never used of the intermediate state. It can only refer to the judgment day, or to the day of persecution in this life. It appears to signify the former here ; and if so, the Apostle is here regarding the day of judgment as a fiery ordeal which will test the work of Christian ministers. If the structure they have reared be durable, "it shall abide." If, however, through weakness and incompetence, they have built one of perishable material, it shall be burnt, and the careless builder shall "suffer loss," even though (since he built on the right foundation) "he himself shall be saved ; yet so as by fire."¹ This appears to be the general drift of the passage ; and, as was said above, it cannot fairly be used in support

¹ Cf. Bp. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of S. Paul*, p. 193 : "That the Apostle does not intend any purgatorial fire by this expression will appear from the following considerations :—(1) Fire is here simply regarded as a destructive agency ; there is no trace here of the idea of refining or purging, an attribute elsewhere given to it, as in Mal. iii. 3, though even there the prophet seems to speak of purging the whole nation by destroying the wicked, not of purging sin in the individual man. (2) The whole image implies a momentary effect, and not a slow, continuous process. The Lord shall appear in a flash of light and a flame of fire. The light shall dart its rays into the innermost recesses of the moral world. The flame shall reduce to ashes the superstructure raised by the careless or unskilful builder. The builder himself shall flee for his life. He shall escape, but scorched, and with the marks of the flames about him."

of the doctrine we are now considering. The fire is *probatory*, not purgatorial; and it is placed at the last day, not in the interval between death and judgment.

Since, then, these passages, which have sometimes been urged in favour of the doctrine, have broken down, it is now generally acknowledged that there is little or nothing directly bearing on the subject in Scripture. The question must, therefore, be decided by broad considerations, and by reference to the general tenor of Scriptural teaching on the state after death, and man's relation to God. In this the following points, which bear on the matter before us, seem to stand out clearly:—

1. *This life* is the time of man's probation; and no countenance is given to the view that a "second chance," or time of probation, is to be looked for after death.¹ "We must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10). The award will, then, be made for *things done in the body*, i.e. in this life.

2. The "dead which die in the Lord" are in a state of peace; "they rest from their labours" (Rev. xiv. 13). So for S. Paul "to depart" is "to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23). But the dead are not yet made perfect. The souls of the martyrs are represented as "under the altar," and crying unto God—"and there was given them to each one a white robe; and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little time, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, which should be killed even as they were, should be fulfilled" (Rev. vi. 9–11; cf. Heb. xi. 40).

The teaching summed up under this last head seems

¹ On 1 Pet. iii. 18, which is sometimes referred to in this connection, see vol. i. p. 170 *seq.*

entirely inconsistent with any notice of a purgatory of pain, to be endured by the great majority of those who die in grace, before they are admitted to the rest of Paradise. But we are told that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. xii. 14); and since the vast mass of the faithful pass out of this life in a state of very imperfect holiness, it is inferred that there is "a place in which souls who depart this life in the grace of God suffer for a time because they still need to be cleansed from venial, or have still to pay the temporal punishment due to mortal, sins, the guilt and the eternal punishment of which have been remitted."¹ In this form the doctrine is stated by modern Romanists. But even in this form (which is very different from the current medieval teaching) it must be rejected as wanting in Scriptural and Patristic authority, as well as because it involves a purgatory of *pain*. That there is *progress* after death would seem to be implied in Scripture;² and it is probable that this may involve a process of gradual purification, only it cannot be said that so much is actually revealed. The possibility remains, that the stains of sin, which cling even to the best, may be removed in the moment of death, so that the sanctification may be complete, "without which no man shall see the Lord." But to many minds it will appear far more probable, and far more in accordance with what we know of God's dealings with men, that as the stains were gradually acquired, and were gradually being removed during this life, so still after death their removal should be gradual. Such a view is certainly not condemned by the terms of the Article before us.³ But

¹ Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 766.

² See Phil. i. 6: "Being confident of this very thing, that He which began a good work in you *will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ.*"

³ Cf. *The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. p. 336: "Nothing,

even though it should appear to be highly probable, it cannot be regarded as revealed doctrine. It is but a "pious opinion," and not a matter which ought to be taught as part of God's certain truth. We may fairly conclude, with Bishop Andrews: "Whatever has not a stronger basis in Holy Scripture may have a place among the opinions of the school, which are not without fear of the contrary being true; but among Articles of faith it cannot. Let it therefore occupy its own place; let it be an opinion . . . but let it not pertain to the faith, nay, let it not even be accounted an ecclesiastical doctrine." ¹

II. *Pardons (Indulgentiæ).*

The **Romish doctrine of pardons** is so closely connected with the theory of "works of supererogation," that in discussing the fourteenth Article it was necessary to anticipate much that would naturally have found a place here. There is no need to repeat the sketch there given of the growth of the system of granting indulgences; or of the Scriptural arguments against the practice. All that seems to be required here is (*a*) to give an explanation of the word "indulgences," and (*b*)

I think, can be clearer than that the Article does *not* condemn *all* doctrine that may be called a doctrine of purgatory. . . . 'Purgatory' is not a word that I should myself spontaneously adopt, because it is associated with Roman theories about the future state for which I see no foundation. But the idea of purgation, of cleansing as by fire, seems to me inseparable from what the Bible teaches us of the Divine chastisements; and though little is said directly respecting the future state, it seems to me incredible that the Divine chastisements should in this respect change their character when this visible life is ended. Neither now nor hereafter is there reason to suppose that they act mechanically as by an irresistible natural process, irrespectively of human will and acceptance." Reference may also be made to Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, p. 307 *seq.*

¹ *Responsio ad Bellarminum*, c. viii. p. 287 (A. C. Lib.).

to add a brief description of the "Romish doctrine" against which the terms of the Article are directed.

(a) *The word "Indulgences."*—The word "indulgentia," which was originally used of gentleness and tenderness, had come in the language of the Latin juriconsults to signify definitely a remission of taxation or of punishment;¹ and in all probability this suggested the technical use of the word which grew up in course of time within the Christian Church. But for centuries before any such technical use can be traced, the word had been a familiar one in Christian circles, in the sense of God's *pardon* and *forgiveness*. It is used in the Vulgate in Is. lxi. 1, "to proclaim liberty to the captives" (et prædicarem captivis *indulgentiam*), as well as in a few other passages;² and is a common word in the writings of the Christian Fathers from the earliest times:³ *indulgentia*, *relaxatio*, *remissio*, and *venia*, all being used generally of the pardon and forgiveness of God, sometimes in connection with the penitential system, and sometimes not. It was shown under Article XIV. that all these words were employed of the formal grants of "pardon" or "indulgence" dispensed by the Pope from the eleventh century onwards; and (probably for the reason stated above) the word "*indulgentiæ*" became in course of time the technical name by which they were known.

In England we find both words, "pardon" and

¹ Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI. v. 16; *Cod. Theod.* IX. xxxiv., *De indulgentiis criminum*.

² Viz. Judith viii. 14; Is. lxi. 7, 9; 1 Cor. vii. 6.

³ Tertullian has it more than once: *De Exhort. Cast.* iii.; *Adv. Valent.* xxix.; *Adv. Marc.* IV. xxix.; and Cyprian uses it, not only of "favour" and "goodness," but definitely of "forgiveness." *De bono patientiæ*, viii. (*indulgentia criminis*); *De lapsis*, xvi. (*remittere aut donare indulgentia sua*); Ep. lv. § 7. See *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. iv. p. 248.

"indulgence," freely used from the days of Langland downwards.

(b) *The Romish doctrine of pardons condemned in the Article.*—The sketch which has been already given of the growth of the system will have shown pretty clearly what the claims made for the indulgences granted by Tetzel and the preachers were.¹ Luther in his famous theses (1517) was prepared to admit them as a relaxation of canonical penance, but no further.² But, as is well known, this was totally insufficient for the ecclesiastical authorities. The decree of Leo x. (1518) reasserted the medieval doctrine, and the papal Bull of excommunication (*Exsurge Domine*, 1520) condemned as pestiferous, pernicious, and scandalous the assertions of Luther on this subject.³ The Council of Trent (1563), as we have seen, retained the custom, though frankly acknowledging the abuses. But unhappily the Roman Church still stands committed to the view that they can avail to help the souls in purgatory, though, as formally held, only *per modum suffragii*; and though the worst scandals have disappeared since the Tridentine decrees were issued, yet it is clear that Rome has retained only too much of the medieval system, and that the indulgences still granted are far more than a mere remission of ecclesiastical penance imposed by the Church. They differ, then, entirely from their original form, having practically little or nothing to do with ecclesiastical censures on the living, but being mainly concerned with God's chastisement in the intermediate state. And while we frankly admit the power of "binding and loosing" which belongs

¹ Cf. also Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, vol. v. p. 58 *seq.*, for an admirable sketch of the development of practice and teaching concerning indulgences.

² The theses are given in full in Schaff's *History of the (Lutheran) Reformation*, vol. i. p. 160 *seq.*

³ See the Bull itself in Schaff, *op. cit.* p. 235.

to the Church, we are compelled to reject altogether the theological defence for indulgences constructed by the schoolmen, and with it the whole practical system of granting them which it was constructed to support.

III. *The Adoration of Images and Relics.*

In considering **the Romish doctrine . . . of the worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques**, it will once more be convenient to make a further division, and to consider separately (*a*) the history of the practice, and (*b*) the Scriptural arguments concerning it.

(*a*) *The history of the practice.*—In the earliest ages of the Church there was some not unnatural hesitation as to the use of art in connection with Christian worship.¹ It had been so steeped in the spirit of an impure heathenism, that the Church was shy of consecrating it for religious purposes. The Catacombs, however, reveal to us the beginnings of a Christian art; and we find from Tertullian that, by the end of the second century, it was customary to paint the figure of the Good Shepherd on the Eucharistic chalice.² In the fourth century, pictures began to be more freely introduced into the churches, though not without protest from various Fathers;³ and

¹ The language of Irenæus on the followers of Carpocrates does not look as if he approved of religious images and pictures, or as if such were usual among Christians: "Etiam imagines, quasdam quidem depictas, quasdam autem et de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicens formam Christi factam a Pilato, illo in tempore quo fuit Jesus cum hominibus. Et has coronant, et proponunt eas cum imaginibus mundi philosophorum, videlicet cum imagine Pythagoræ, et Platonis, et Aristotelis, et reliquorum; et reliquam observationem circa eas similiter ut gentes faciunt."—*Adv. Hær.* I. xx.

² "Pastor quem in chalice depingis."—*De pudic.* c. x.; cf. c. vii. "picturæ calicum."

³ *E.g.* Epiphanius (390) describes how he found a painting of Christ or

from this time forward the cultus of both images and relics seems steadily to have increased. A great impetus was given to the latter by S. Helena's discovery of the remains of the true cross in 326. By the close of the fourth century it was believed that miracles were wrought by the relics of the saints and martyrs;¹ and by the eighth century, in spite of protests raised from time to time,² the practice of paying "worship" and "adoration" to images and relics had reached such a height that a reaction set in, and a vigorous protest was made against it. Whereas originally pictures and images had been but the "books of the unlearned," by this time they had come to be regarded with such superstitious reverence, and such acts of homage and "worship" were paid to them, that the Church could with difficulty be cleared from the charge of idolatry. Hence the great "iconoclastic controversy" of the eighth century, in which for the most part the Emperors at Constantinople (*e.g.* Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus) took the lead in destroying the images, and the Popes at Rome constituted themselves the champions of the cultus. Into the dreary history of the controversy there is no need to enter here.³ It will be sufficient to mention that the

some saint on a curtain in a church at Anablatha in Palestine, and tore it down because it was contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, in *S. Hieronymi Epistolæ*, li. 9. So the Council of Elvira (A.D. 305) forbade pictures to be placed in churches: "Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur."—Canon xxxvi. This was "evidently not directed against a prospective or imaginary danger, but against an actual and probably a growing practice."—Westcott, *Epp. of S. John*, p. 329.

¹ See Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XXII. viii., and *Confessions*, IX. vii., for notices of some of these.

² See the letters of Gregory the Great to Serenus, *Epp.* VII. ii. 3, and IX. iv. 9.

³ See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 339 *seq.*, and the excellent lecture in Archbp. Trench's *Medieval Church History*, Lect. vii.

decisions of the iconoclastic Council of 754 at Constantinople (which claimed to be a general one) were reversed by the Council of Nicæa in 787, which has been finally accepted by both Greeks and Latins as the seventh General Council. At this the worship of images was decreed, and the following canon was passed:—

“With the venerable and life-giving Cross shall be set up the venerable and holy images, whether in colour, in mosaic work, or any other material, within the consecrated churches of God, on the sacred vessels and vestments, on the walls, and on tablets, on houses, and in highways—the images, that is to say, of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of the immaculate mother of God, of the honoured angels, of all saints and holy men. These images shall be treated as holy memorials, worshipped, kissed, only without that peculiar adoration (*λάτρευα*) which is reserved for the Invisible, Incomprehensible God.”¹

Even after this the struggle lasted a short time longer. In 814 a Council was held at Constantinople under the Emperor Leo the Armenian, which confirmed the decrees of the previous Council of 754 and anathematised the image worshippers. But, finally, in the reign of Michael Porphyrogenitus (840) the iconoclastic party entirely collapsed, and the “feast of orthodoxy” was established to commemorate the triumph of their

¹ Ὅριζομεν οὖν ἀκριβεῖα πάση καὶ ἐμμελεῖα παραπλησίως τῷ τυπῷ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ ἀνατίθασθαι τὰς σέπτας καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας, τὰς ἐκ χρωμάτων καὶ ψηφίδος καὶ ἐτέρας ὕλης ἐπιτηδεύας ἐχούσας ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις, ἐν ἱεροῖς σκεύεσι καὶ ἐσθήσι, τοίχοις τε καὶ σανίσιν, οἴκοις τε καὶ ὁδοῖς· τῆς τε τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνας, καὶ τῆς ἀχράντου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου, τιμίων τε ἀγγέλων, καὶ πάντων ἁγίων καὶ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν . . . καὶ ταύταις ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἥ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεῖα φύσει.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. iv. p. 456. The translation given above is in Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 391.

opponents. From this time forward we hear but little of any opposition to image worship,¹ and the practice was generally accepted without question in both East² and West, until S. Thomas Aquinas lays down definitely that "the same reverence should be displayed towards an image of Christ and towards Christ Himself; and seeing that Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria*, it follows that His image is to be adored with the adoration of *latria*"; and again, "the Cross is adored with the same adoration as Christ, that is, with the adoration of *latria*, and for that reason we address and supplicate the Cross just as we do the Crucified Himself."³ In accordance with this we find in the Roman Missal an office for the adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, in which full directions are given for the adoration of the Cross, and an antiphon is sung, beginning, "Crucem tuam adoramus

¹ The Council of Frankfort (794), however, rejected the second Council of Nicæa, and the Caroline books absolutely condemned any adoration or worship of images. See Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 153 *seq.*

² The Eastern Church, it should be mentioned, while it encourages the veneration of pictures, does not admit sculptured or hewn images. The "icons" of the East are really pictures. For the Greek teaching on the subject see Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 76. One quotation may suffice here. 'Ἡμεῖς θραν τιμῶμεν τὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὰς προσκυνοῦμεν, δὲν προσκυνοῦμεν τὰ χρώματα ἢ τὰ ξύλα. μὰ τοὺς ἁγίους ἐκείνους, τῶν ὁποίων εἶναι αἱ εἰκόνες, δοξάζομεν μὲ προσκύνησιν δουλείας, βάλλωντας μὲ τὸν νοῦν μας τὴν ἐκείνων παρουσίαν εἰς τὰ ὀμμάτιά μας.—*Conf. Orthodox.* p. 328.

³ "Sequitur quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi et ipsi Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione *latriæ* consequens est quod ejus imago sit adoratione *latriæ* adoranda." "[Crux] utroque modo adoratur eadem adoratione cum Christo, scil. adoratione *latriæ*. Et propter hoc etiam crucem alloquimur et deprecamur quasi ipsum crucifixum."—*Summa* III. Q. xxv. arts. iii. iv. In view of the distinction drawn by Romanists between *latria*, the worship due to God alone, *hyperdulia*, that due to the Blessed Virgin, and *dulia*, that which is due to the saints, these words have caused no little difficulty, and are frequently explained away. But the statement of S. Thomas is clear enough and gives to the Cross *latria*.

Domine";¹ and in our own country the Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel, in 1408, emphatically urge the practice. "From henceforth let it be taught commonly, and preached by all, that the Cross and the image of the Crucified, and the rest of the images of the saints, in memory and honour of them whom they figure, as also their places and relics, ought to be worshipped (*venerari*) with processions, bendings of the knees, bowings of the body, incensings, kissings, offerings, lightings of candles, and pilgrimages, together with all other manners and forms whatsoever as hath been accustomed to be done in our predecessors' times."² It is needless to add illustrations of the gross abuses and superstitions, such as that of the "Rood of Boxley,"³ which had been exposed in the early years of the sixteenth century,—abuses which afford a painfully strong justification of the vigorous language in condemnation of this worshipping and adoration of images and relics contained in the Article before us.⁴

(b) *The Scriptural arguments concerning the practice.*—It might have been supposed that it would be sufficient to quote the language of the second commandment as entirely prohibiting worship in any form being offered to

¹ *Missale Romanum*. Feria vi. in Parasceve.

² "Ab omnibus deinceps doceatur communiter atque prædicetur, crucem et imaginem crucifixi cæterasque imagines sanctorum, in ipsorum memoriam et honorem quos figurant, ac ipsorum loca et reliquias, processionibus, genuflexionibus, inclinationibus, thurificationibus, deoscultationibus, oblationibus, luminarium accensionibus, et peregrinationibus, nec non aliis quibuscunque modis et formis quibus nostris et predecessorum nostrorum temporibus fieri consuevit, venerari debere."—See Johnson's *English Canons*, vol. ii. p. 469, and Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, V. De hæret. cap. *Nullus quoque*.

³ See Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, vol. ii. p. 52 seq.

⁴ It should also be mentioned that in the Second Book of the Homilies there is a lengthy Homily on this subject, entitled "Against Peril of Idolatry."

images;¹ but since it has appeared to Roman Catholics that the Scriptures contain instances of image worship and exhortation to it, it may be well to examine the passages alleged by them. The action of David in dancing before the ark (2 Sam. vi.) has been referred to, but it is difficult to see what justification there is for the assertion that any *worship*, be it *latría* or *dulia*, was paid by him to it. But it is said that the 99th Psalm contains a direct charge to “adore His footstool, for it is holy,” and that the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that Jacob “adored the top of his rod.”² These two instances shall be considered, and if nothing stronger is forthcoming it may safely be concluded that there is not a shred of evidence in favour of the practice to be adduced from Holy Scripture, or to be set against the emphatic condemnation of it in the Decalogue.³

¹ It need hardly be said that the second commandment cannot be strained into a condemnation of images and pictures as works of art, or for purposes of instruction. Had this been so, the figures of the cherubim, oxen, and lions would never have found place in the Tabernacle or Temple.

² Both of these passages are referred to as authorising “relative honour to the images of Christ and the saints” in a table of references at the end of a copy of the Douay Bible lying before me; and to the passage in Heb. xi. 21 is appended the following note: “The apostle here follows the ancient Greek Bible of the Seventy interpreters (which translates in this manner Gen. xlvii. 31), and alleges this fact of Jacob, in paying a relative veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph as to a figure of Christ’s sceptre and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith. But some translators, who are no friends to this relative honour, have corrupted the text by translating it, *he worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff*: as if this circumstance of leaning upon his staff were any argument of Jacob’s faith, or worthy the being thus particularly taken notice of by the Holy Ghost.” The remarks above will show who are the real “corrupters of the text.”

³ It is, to say the least, unfortunate that in the great majority of Roman Catholic Catechisms the Commandments are given in an abbreviated form, and, since according to the reckoning which obtains among them our *first* and *second* commandments form but one, the condemnation of image worship is *practically* unknown by the vast mass of the laity among them.

Ps. xcix. 5 in the English version stands as follows: "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at His footstool, for it is holy" (R.V., He is holy). In the "Douay version," however, which is commonly used by Roman Catholics, it stands thus: "Adore His footstool, for it is holy." The origin of the difference is this. The English version is taken from the Hebrew, and adequately represents the original הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְפִתְּלֹכָיו. The Douay version is translated from the Vulgate (Ps. xcvi. 5), where the preposition is ignored and the words rendered, "Adorate scabellum pedum ejus quoniam sanctum est."¹ Thus *the argument rests entirely on a mistranslation*. The same is true of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 21). Here again the Vulgate, "adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus," *entirely misrepresents the meaning of the original*. The Greek is *προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ*, words which can only mean that Jacob worshipped *upon* (i.e. as the A.V. and R.V. "*leaning upon*") the top of his staff. With regard to the Scriptural argument for the adoration of relics, from the miracle wrought by the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21) and the "handkerchiefs and aprons" brought from the body of S. Paul (Acts xix. 12), it cannot be said that they are worth anything. Neither the bones nor the handkerchiefs were preserved to be adored;² and until

¹ The construction in the original is precisely the same as in ver. 9, where both the Douay version and the Vulgate render correctly enough "Adore *at* His holy mountain," "Adorate *in* monte sancto ejus." Whereas, if only they were consistent, the mountain would have to be adored as well as the footstool.

² Cf. the Martyrdom of Polycarp, c. xvii., where the Christians pour scorn on the notion that they would want to worship the body of the saint, or worship any other than Christ. *Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ νῦν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ προσκυνούμεν, τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως ἐνεκεν εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλεῖα καὶ διδάσκαλον.* — Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. ii. § ii. p. 979.

something stronger is adduced by our opponents, we may safely rest satisfied that nothing stronger can be found.

III. *The Invocation of Saints.*

Once more we must consider separately (*a*) the history of the practice, and (*b*) the Scriptural argument concerning it.

(*a*) *The history of the practice.*—In tracing out the growth of the custom of invoking the saints at rest, it will be well to start from the fact that the early Church undoubtedly believed that they were still engaged in interceding for those whose warfare was not yet accomplished,¹ and very generally *prayed to God* to be benefited by a share in the prayers of the saints.² But there can also be no doubt that the early Christians did not think it right directly to ask the saints to use those intercessions, in whose efficacy she yet believed. The only writer during the first three centuries who has been quoted in favour of direct invocation is Origen (220), and it seems almost certain that in the passage in question he is really referring, not to the saints at rest, but to those still on earth. His words are these: "It is not improper to offer supplication, intercession, and thanksgiving to saints: and two of these—I mean intercession and thanksgiving—not only to saints, but to mere men; but supplication to saints only, if any Peter or Paul can be found, that they may help us: making us worthy to enjoy the licence which was granted them of forgiving sins."³ This passage, says Dean Luckock,

¹ See Origen, *In Jesu Nave*, Hom. xvi. c. 5; *In Cant.*, Lib. iii.; *Ep. ad Rom.*, Comment. ii. 4; Cyprian, *Ep.* lx.; *De Mortalitate*, ad fin. etc.; and cf. Luckock, *After Death*, part II. c. i.

² Such prayers are found in all the ancient Liturgies, in which there is no direct invocation of the saints themselves.

³ Δέξιν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν οὐκ ἀποπον καὶ ἁγίοις προσ-

“seems to have been quite unjustly claimed in favour of addressing petitions to departed saints. It is next to certain, as the whole context shows, that he had in his mind none but living saints.”¹ And this explanation is confirmed by words which he uses elsewhere, saying of the “ten thousand sacred powers” which men “have on their side when they pray to God,” that *uninvoked* (ἄκλητοι), these pray with them and bring help to our perishable race, and, if I may so speak, take up arms alongside of it.”²

It is, then, only in the latter part of the fourth century that the evidence for direct invocation really begins.³ The Fathers of this age who have been cited in favour of the practice are these: in the East, S. Basil the Great (370), Gregory Nazianzen (370) and Gregory Nyssen (370), Ephraem the Syrian (370) and S. Chrysostom (390). In the West, S. Ambrose (380) and S. Augustine (400). Their testimony has been carefully examined by Dean Luckock in his volume *After Death*, and the conclusion at which he arrives is that “S. Chrysostom’s contradictions are such as to invalidate his evidence, that S. Gregory Nazianzen speaks doubtfully, that S. Ambrose, in the little which he has said upon the subject, is inconsistent with himself; but that the testimony of SS. Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Ephraem, and Augustine remains so far unshaken.”⁴ Some of the

ενέγκειν ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν δύο, λέγω δὴ ἐντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν οὐ μόνον ἀγίοις ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ἀνθρώποις, τὴν δὲ δέησιν μόνον ἀγίοις, εἰ τις εὐρεθελὴ Παῦλος ἢ Πέτρος ἵνα ὠφελήσωσιν ἡμᾶς ἀξίους ποιοῦντες τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς δεδομένης αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίας πρὸς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀφίεναι.—*De Oratione*, 14.

¹ *After Death*, p. 187.

² Ὡστε τολμᾶν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀνθρώποις, μετὰ προαιρέσεως προτιθεμένοις τὰ κρείττονα, εὐχομένοις τῷ Θεῷ μυρία δοῦναι ἄκλητοι συνεύχονται δυνάμεις ἱεραὶ, συμπαρέχουσαι τῷ ἐπικερῷ ἡμῶν γένει, καὶ ἵν’ οὕτως εἴπω, συναγωνίσωμαι.—*Contra Celsum*, viii. 64.

³ It ought to be mentioned that such prayers are found (undated) in the Catacombs.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 197.

passages in these Fathers certainly appear to be nothing more than rhetorical appeals, which can scarcely have been intended to be taken as seriously implying that the person so addressed was expected to be cognisant of the utterance,—as when S. Gregory Nazianzen apostrophises Constantius: “Hear, O soul of great Constantius (if thou hast any faculty of perception), and ye souls of all the kings who before him loved Christ.”¹ Concerning the intention of others, however, there is no room for doubt;² and it cannot be denied that by the time of Augustine the practice of directly invoking the saints was firmly established *as a popular one*, though even so there is no trace of such invocations being admitted into the formal services of the Church. Rather, it would appear from the language of Augustine that they were not allowed; for in a passage in which he is speaking of the miracles wrought by the martyrs, “or rather,” as he corrects himself, by “God who does them, while they pray and assist,” he says, “we do not erect altars at these monuments that we may sacrifice to the martyrs, but to the one God of the martyrs and of ourselves, and in this sacrifice they are named in their own place, and rank as men of God who conquered the world by confessing Him, *but they are not invoked by the sacrificing priest*” (*non tamen a sacerdote qui sacrificat invocantur*).³ After this time it would seem

¹ *Adv. Jul. Imp. Invect.* i. *Orat.* iv. 3.

² Thus S. Basil says: “I accept also the holy apostles, prophets, and martyrs, and I invoke them (*ἐπικαλοῦμαι*) for their supplication to God, that by them, that is, by their mediation, the merciful God may take compassion upon me, and that there may be granted to me redemption for mine offences.”—*Ex epist. ad Julian Apost.* ccelx.; cf. *De Mart. Mamante*, *Hom.* xxiii. and *Hom. in xl. Mart.* § 8. These and the other passages from the Fathers mentioned in the text are all quoted in full in Luckock, *op. cit.*

³ *De Civit. Dei*, Bk. xxii. c. x.: “Just before this (c. viii.) Augustine has told a story of a tailor who had lost his coat, and had prayed to the

that the custom grew apace. The practice having once established itself spread throughout the East and West,¹ and became part of the system of the Church. By the eighth century the invocations were introduced into the Litanies of the Church,² the only public authorised service in which they have ever been prominent, except later devotions in honour of the Blessed Virgin. Nor, unhappily, did the system long remain what it had been at first, *i.e.* merely asking the saints to pray for us. In time the saints were often invoked as if they were the authors of benefits; and the Blessed Virgin, in particular, was addressed in language which (with every wish to be charitable) it is impossible to avoid stigmatising as blasphemous and idolatrous. Thus in Bonaventura's *Crown of the Blessed Virgin Mary* we read: "O Empress and our most kind lady, by the authority of a mother command thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would vouchsafe to lift up our minds," etc.³ Much more of the same character may be found in the *Psalter of the Blessed Virgin*,⁴ attributed to the same writer. And it cannot be doubted that in the sixteenth century

twenty martyrs, begging in a distinct voice that he might be heard." The sequel was evidently regarded by Augustine as a direct answer to his petition. Cf. also *De Cura pro mortuis*, c. iv.

¹ At the present day the doctrine of the Eastern Church on this subject differs in no respect from the formal teaching of the Latin Church. See Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 70, where citations are given from the "Orthodox Confession" of 1643, and that of Metrophanes Critopulus (1625). Cf. also the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* (translated by R. W. Blackmore), p. 78.

² It is hard to say exactly when they were introduced; but it was certainly some time before the middle of the eighth century. See the seventeenth canon of the Council of Clovesho (A.D. 747), which orders the name of Augustine to be introduced into the Litany, "post Sancti Gregorii vocationem." Haddan and Stubbs, vol. iii. p. 368.

³ See Usher's *Answer to Jesuit*, p. 424, where this and much more of the same kind is quoted.

⁴ Usher, *l.c.*

the practical system connected with the invocation of saints was grossly superstitious.¹ It naturally excited the indignation of our Reformers, and hence the emphatic condemnation of the "Romish doctrine" on the subject in the Article before us, and the vigorous polemic contained in the Homily "Concerning Prayer" which was issued in the reign of Elizabeth.²

(b) *The Scriptural argument concerning invocation of saints.*—In considering the teaching of Scripture on this subject, it is well to remember that it is admitted by all parties that to regard the saints as the *authors* of the benefits which they are asked to obtain is wrong,³ and contrary to Scripture, which distinctly forbids the worship of a creature, and contains striking instances of the refusal of worship by both men and angels. Thus in Acts x. 25 we read: "When it came to pass that Peter entered, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet and

¹ Thus Erasmus writes: "I call it superstition when all things are asked from the saints as if Christ were dead; or when we implore the aid of the saints with the idea that they are more easily intreated than God; or when we seek some particular thing from each, as if S. Catherine could bestow what S. Barbara could not; or when we call upon them, not as intercessors, but as authors of those good things which God grants us. I think that it may seem impious to thee to animadvert upon these things, but I well know that it would not seem superfluous, if thou knewest the prodigious superstition of our fellow-countrymen on this matter."—*Epist. ad Jac. Sadolet.*, quoted in Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, vol. ii. p. 310. Cf. the "Ten Articles" of 1536, where, though direct invocation is retained, a caution is added, that "it be done without any vain superstition, so as to think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that one saint doth serve for one thing more than another, or is patron of the same."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 15.

² See the "second part of the Homily Concerning Prayer," *The Homilies*, p. 341 (S.P.C.K.).

³ Bellarmine says, that as far as words go, it is lawful to say: "S. Peter pity me, save me, open for me the gate of heaven"; also "give me health of body, patience, fortitude," etc., provided that we mean "save and pity me by praying for me"; "Grant me this or that by thy prayers and merits."

worshipped him (*προσεκύνησεν*). But Peter raised him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man.”¹ So in the Revelation, twice over S. John “fell down before the feet of the angel to worship him” (*προσκυῖναι*), and twice over the angel refuses the worship. “See thou do it not; I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren that hold the testimony of Jesus” (xix. 10). “See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them which keep the words of this book: worship God” (xxii. 9). The advocates of the invocations would not attempt to justify more than the “Ora pro nobis” or its equivalent (since they explain away the far stronger language habitually used in their popular devotions). And even here they are compelled to admit that there is nothing in Scripture which *directly* sanctions the practice. It is based by them (1) on the evidence that the saints at rest are engaged in interceding for us, and (2) on the admitted power of intercessory prayer. To these arguments we reply, *first*, that it may be freely conceded that Holy Scripture does appear to imply that the saints at rest do pray for those still on earth,² and

¹ Acts xiv. 13 *seq.*, which is sometimes quoted against the invocation of saints, seems really not to bear upon the subject, for the men of Lystra desired to offer to the apostles divine honour, as to heathen deities; which under no circumstances could they have accepted. It is very different, therefore, from the passages cited in the text.

² This was certainly the belief of the Jews, as is shown by more than one passage in the Apocrypha. See 2 Macc. xv. 12-14: “And this was his vision: that Onias, who had been high priest . . . holding up his hands prayed for the whole body of the Jews. This done, in like manner there appeared a man with grey hairs, and exceeding glorious, who was of a wonderful and excellent majesty. Then Onias answered, saying, This is a lover of the brethren, who prayeth much for the people, and for the holy city, to wit, Jeremias, the prophet of God.” Cf. Tobit xii. 12, where Raphael, “one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints,” speaks of “bringing the remembrance” of Tobit’s prayers “before the Holy One.” Cf. also Rev. viii. 3, 4, and v. 8.

that therefore it cannot be wrong to ask God for a share in their prayers.¹ But when we are asked to go further, and address the saints themselves, we may well hesitate; for though, *secondly*, we fully believe in the power of intercessory prayer, yet if we wish to ask an earthly friend to exercise it for us, we take care that our words can reach him; and so, before asking the saints to do the same, we require evidence that they are cognisant of our prayers. With Bishop Richard Montague (1624) we say: "Demonstrate unto me infallibly by reason, Scripture, authentic tradition, that saints departed are all of them, or any of them, interested ordinarily *rebus viventium*; that by either evening or morning knowledge, natural endowment, or acquired accruments, by Divine revelation, angelical revelation, or other means, they do or can know and understand my necessities, exigencies, prayers, or practice in any time or place when I call upon them, or unto them, and I will unfeignedly join hands of fellowship, and say, 'Saint *Peter*, Saint *Paul*, pray for me.' Until that, ἐπέχω; and so I think will any desire to be excused for invocation; for to be persuaded, as some have told me that in their opinion saints nor do nor can be privy unto my necessities, nor hear my prayers, and yet to pray unto them, is to my understanding so poor a part of piety that it is without warrant of common sense."²

It does not appear that there is any evidence in Holy

¹ Cf. Field, *Of the Church*, Bk. iii. Appendix: "That the saints do pray for us *in genere*, desiring God to be merciful to us, and to do unto us whatsoever in any kind He knoweth needful for our good, there is no question made by us; and therefore this prayer wherein the Church desireth God to be gracious to her and to grant the things she desireth, the rather for that the saints in heaven also are suppliant for her, will not be found to contain any point of Romish doctrine disliked by us."

² *A Treatise of the Invocation of Saints*, p. 218, quoted in H. R. Percival's *Invocation of Saints*, p. 111.

Scripture that the saints are already admitted to the beatific vision, or that they are cognisant of our prayers, such as would warrant us in addressing them.¹ Nor can it be said that there has been any certain and consistent tradition of the Church on the subject which would justify us in regarding it as "a Catholic practice." As we have already seen, there is no trace of direct invocation before the last half of the fourth century. In the fifth century S. Augustine uses language which betrays considerable doubt when discussing the question whether the saints know what is passing on earth.² In the twelfth century, all that Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, can say with regard to the theory which obtains most widely at the present day, is that "it is *not incredible* that the souls of the saints, which in their secret dwelling rejoice in the illumination of the true light of the face of God, do in the contemplation thereof understand the things which are done in this outer world, as much as pertaineth either to them for joy or to us for aid. For as to the angels, so also to the saints, who stand before God, our petitions are made known in the word of God which they contemplate."³ Still later, Dun Scotus maintains "that it does not belong to the essence of blessedness that the blessed

¹ It would be precarious in the extreme to build anything upon Heb. xii. 1, where the word for "witnesses" is *μαρτύρες*.

² The question is discussed by Augustine in *De cura pro mortuis*, c. xiii. *seq.*; and though Augustine believed that the martyrs were able to help the living, he confesses that he is utterly unable to solve the question how they are made aware of what passes on earth.

³ "Sed forte queris, Num quid preces supplicantium sancti audiunt, et vota postulantium in eorum notitiam perveniunt? Non est incredibile animas sanctorum, quæ in abscondito faciei Dei veri luminis illustratione lætantur, in ipsius contemplatione ea quæ foris aguntur intelligere, quantum vel illis ad gaudium vel nobis ad auxilium pertinet. Sicut enim angelis, ita et sanctis qui Deo assistant, petitiones nostræ innotescunt in Verbo Dei quod contemplantur."—*Sentent.* IV. *dist.* xlv. 6.

hear our prayers, though it is *probable* that God reveals them to them";¹ and even so late as the sixteenth century Cardinal Cajetan is forced to admit that "we have no certain knowledge as to whether the saints are aware of our prayers, *though we piously believe it.*"²

In the absence, therefore, of any distinct revelation, and in the face of so much doubt and uncertainty, it would appear that the Church of England is amply justified (1) in removing from the public services of the Church all traces of such direct invocations, including the "Ave Maria" as well as the "Ora pro nobis";³ and (2) in condemning in round terms in the Article before us the current teaching and practice, which can be abundantly shown to be **a fond⁴ thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.**

¹ "Non esse ex ratione beatitudinis, quod beati audiant orationes nostras, probabile tamen esse quod Deus ipse revelat."—*In Sent.* IV. *dist.* xlv. q. 4, quoted in Forbes, *Consid. Modest.* vol. ii. p. 178.

² "Certa ratione nescimus an sancti nostra cognoscant, quamvis pie hoc credamus."—*In* 2a 2æ, q. lxxxviii. art. 5, quoted in Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 176.

³ When the English Litany was first published in 1544, all the invocations of saints (which had formed so prominent a feature in this service) were deleted, except three clauses, namely—

"Saint Mary, mother of God our Saviour Jesu Christ, pray for us.

"All holy angels and archangels, and all holy orders of blessed spirits, pray for us.

"All holy patriarchs and prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins, and all the blessed company of heaven, pray for us."

On the publication of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. in 1549 these three clauses were omitted, and all trace of the direct invocation of the saints was removed from the public offices of the English Church.

⁴ Fond (*inanis*), *i.e.* foolish. Shakespeare uses the word in the same sense—

"Thou *fond* mad man, hear me but speak a word."

Romeo and Juliet, III. iii. 52.

"And for his dreams, I wonder he is so *fond*

To trust the mockery of unquiet slumber."

Richard III. III. ii. 26.

ARTICLE XXIII

De vocatione Ministrorum.

Non licet cuicumque sumere sibi munus publice prædicandi, aut administrandi sacramenta in ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad hæc obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est in ecclesia, cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus.

Of Ministering in the Congregation.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments in the congregation before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

THERE has been no change in the substance of this Article since it was first published in 1553. In that edition, however, and also in that of 1563, the title ran: "Nemo in ecclesia ministret nisi vocatus" ("No man may minister in the congregation except he be called"). The present title was substituted for this at the final revision in 1571.

The ultimate source of this Article is the fourteenth, "De ordine ecclesiastico," of the Confession of Augsburg: "De ordine ecclesiastico docent quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus." Its debt to this Confession is, however, only indirect; for there can be little doubt that its immediate origin was the corresponding Article in the unfinished series of 1538, agreed upon by a joint-

committee of Anglican and Lutheran divines.¹ This document adopts the language of the Augsburg Confession, but adds additional matter to it, which suggested the latter part of our own Article: "De ministris ecclesiæ docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, aut sacramenta ministrare, nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in ecclesia, juxta verbum Dei, et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi et admittendi."² Since the Lutherans were lacking in episcopal government, it is obvious that in any common formula to be agreeable to both parties refuge must be taken in language of a vague and general character. Hence the reference to "the laws and customs of each country," which was omitted when the Article was remodelled for the use of the Anglican Church alone.

The object of the Article is to condemn the theory held by many of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, that "anyone believing himself to be called to the ministry, was bound to exercise his functions as a preacher in defiance of all Church authority."³ The same error is condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which, after the mention of various Anabaptist errors, we come to the following passage:—

"Similis est eorum amentia qui institutionem ministrorum ab ecclesia disjungunt, negantes in certis locis certos doctores, pastores atque ministros collocari debere; nec admittunt legitimos vocationes, nec solemnem manuum impositionem, sed per omnes publice docendi potestatem divulgant, qui sacris literis utique sunt aspersi, et Spiritum sibi vendicant; nec illos solum adhibent ad docendum, sed etiam ad moderandam ecclesiam, et distribuenda sacramenta; quæ sane universa cum Scriptis Apostolorum manifeste pugnant."⁴

¹ See vol. i. p. 6.

² See Hardwick, p. 270.

³ Hardwick, p. 102.

⁴ *Ref. Leg. Eccles., De Hæres. c. xvi.*

So in Hermann's *Consultation* it is said of some of the Anabaptists, that they "disperse the outward ministerie and doctrine of the Church, they denie that God worketh by the same. They teache that we muste looke for private illuminations and visions. Wherefore thei avoyed the common sermons of the Church, and holye assembles of the people of Christe, they wyth-drawe from the sacraments," etc.¹

Such a view as that here condemned can only lead to confusion and disorder, for according to it anyone who claims for himself the Spirit may set himself up as a minister of the word and sacraments, with no commission whatever from any external authority. In opposition to this the statement of the Article is clear and decisive. It falls into two parts, each of which requires some little consideration—

1. The need of an external call and mission.
2. The description of those through whom the call comes.

I. *The Need of an external Call and Mission.*

It is not lawful² for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments in the congregation (in ecclesia),³ before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. "Called and sent." The two words (which are repeated in the second part of the Article) should be carefully noticed. They refer to distinct things: the *call*, to the original

¹ English translation of 1548, fol. cxlii.

² Evidently, though this is not stated, by the law of God.

³ It is not clear why throughout this Article, in the heading as well as in the body of the Article, *ecclesia* is rendered by *congregation* and not by *Church*.

summons to enter the ministry: the *mission*, to the commission to execute it in a particular sphere. Unless the need of each of these is recognised there can only arise confusion, as if only the *call* were necessary different ministers properly ordained might assert rival claims to execute their office in the same place, and the whole principle of Church order would be destroyed. To obviate this they must be "*sent* to execute the same," as well as "*called*" to the office. Thus the requirement of "*mission*" follows from the general principle that "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace"; and from the necessity that "*all things*" should "*be done decently and in order.*"¹ With regard to the "*call*" to the ministry, all Christians are agreed that a call from God is necessary before a man can presume to teach and minister in His name. "No man taketh the honour unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron," and "how shall they preach except they be sent"?² So much is admitted by all. The question really is whether the "*inward call*" requires to be supplemented by an external one. And here all the evidence from Scripture and antiquity is in favour of insisting upon one from properly constituted authorities. While it cannot be doubted that under the Old Covenant in addition to the regularly constituted priesthood and Levitical ministry, God did from time to time raise up the prophets as His messengers, and send them forth with no commission from men, as he did afterward at the beginning of the gospel in the case of S. Paul, who always claimed to hold his apostolate "*not from (ἀπό) men, neither through (διά) men, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father,*"³ yet in these cases the call was authenticated by signs which could be recognised and

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 40.

² Heb. v. 4 ; Rom. x. 15.

³ Gal. i. 1.

known by men.¹ The gift of prophecy and the power of working miracles no longer remaining with the Church, it can easily be seen that unless the necessity of an external call were insisted on, the Church would be at the mercy of any religious fanatic who might be pleased to claim to be taught by the Spirit of God.² And so we find that, as a matter of fact, from the very first men were set apart by the properly constituted authorities of the Church, and did not take upon themselves the ministerial office without such a call. Thus the seven were "appointed" (οὓς καταστήσωμεν) to the ministry by the Apostles, after they had been "chosen" (ἐξελέξαντο) by the whole multitude.³ Paul and Barnabas "appointed" elders in every church (χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν).⁴ Timothy received the gift "through (διὰ) the laying on of" S. Paul's hands, or, as it is elsewhere said, "through (διὰ) prophecy, with (μετά) the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."⁵ Titus is commissioned to "appoint elders in every city,"⁶ and Timothy receives full instructions as to the character and qualifications of those who are to be admitted into the ministry.⁷ These facts seem quite decisive, and it is a simple fact of history that from the Apostles' day to the present time the Church has always required an

¹ See Deut. xviii. 20-22.

² It will be remembered that the Church of England is equally emphatic in insisting on the need of an "inward" call, the first question addressed to candidates for the ministry being this—"Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people?" Not till this has been satisfactorily answered is the further question put concerning the external call—"Do you think that you are truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due order of this realm, to the ministry of the Church?"

³ Acts vi. 1-6.

⁴ Acts xiv. 23.

⁵ Cf. 2 Tim. i. 6 with 1 Tim. iv. 14.

⁶ Titus i. 5.

⁷ 1 Tim. iii.

external call in the case of all those whom she has recognised as Christian ministers. There is no necessity to prove this at length; but a single passage may be quoted from the first of the Christian Fathers to indicate how the matter was regarded in the very early times, and the principle of succession laid down—

“Our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop’s office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministration. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men of repute with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ . . . these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration.”¹

II. *The Description of those through whom the Call comes.*

While the Article is perfectly clear in asserting the need of an external call, it cannot be maintained that it

¹ Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόβλεψιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπιμονὴν δεδώκασιν ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ’ ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ’ ἐτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . τοὺτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας.—*Ad Cor. I. xliv.* On the reading and difficult word ἐπιμονὴν see Lightfoot’s note, *ad loc.* The old Latin published by Dom Morin (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. ii.) seems to have had ἐπινομίην, which it rendered by “legem.” Whichever be right, and whether κοιμηθῶσιν refers to the death of the presbyters or of the apostles themselves, the principle of succession to the ministry, and of the need of an external call to it, is here clearly traced to the appointment of the apostles themselves.

is equally clear in its description of those who are empowered to give this call. **Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.** Who are these men "who have public authority given them in the congregation" (*ecclesia*)? The Article fails to tell us, and its silence on this point is to some extent explained (as we have seen) by the source to which it can be traced. But though an Article on the subject of the ministry, designed to be subscribed by Lutherans and Anglicans, must needs be vague and indefinite, the question may fairly be asked, Why, when the Article was to be signed by Anglicans alone, was not the indefiniteness removed, and a plain statement describing the proper authorities inserted? To this it may be answered that Article XXXV. of 1553 referred definitely to the "book of ordering ministers of the Church" as "godly and in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel, but agreeable thereto," while the corresponding Article (XXXVI.) of the Elizabethan revision supported the claims of the Ordinal more definitely, asserting that it "doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering: neither hath it anything that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And, therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward unto this time, or shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered." These citations show that the omission in the Article before us is made up elsewhere, and that the words under consideration are intended to refer to

the bishops, to whom alone is given in the Church of England this "public authority to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." And, since the reference of the terms was thus rendered unmistakable, it was probably considered unnecessary to introduce a more formal mention of the Episcopate here.¹ It will therefore be more convenient that in this Commentary upon the Articles the discussion of the questions connected with the Episcopate and the threefold ministry should be reserved until they can be treated of in connection with that Article in which they are distinctly mentioned.

¹ It must be remembered that the Articles were not designed to be a complete system of theology. Originally they were merely intended to be a *practical* test, called forth by the exigencies of the times. At the time when they were first drawn up in 1553 there was no practical question at issue in this country between Episcopal orders and Presbyterian; and all that was really necessary was to assert against the Anabaptists the need of an external call.

ARTICLE XXIV

*De precibus publicis dicendis in
lingua vulgari.*

Lingua populo non intellecta
publicas in ecclesia preces peragere,
aut Sacramenta administrare, verbo
Dei et primitivæ ecclesiæ con-
suetudini plane repugnat.

*Of Speaking in the Congregation in
such a Tongue as the People
understandeth.*

It is a thing plainly repugnant
to the word of God, and the custom
of the primitive Church, to have
public prayer in the Church or to
minister the Sacraments in a tongue
not understood of the people.

THIS Article was rewritten and brought into its present form by Archbishop Parker in 1563. The corresponding Article in the Edwardian Series was this: "*Men must speak in the congregation in such tongue as the people understandeth.*"¹ It is most seemly and most agreeable to the word of God, that in the congregation nothing be openly read or spoken in a tongue unknown to the people, the which thing S. Paul did forbid, except some were present that should declare the same." The difference is practically this: Whereas in 1553 the Church of England contented herself with asserting that it was "most seemly and most agreeable to the word of God" that public worship should be held in a tongue familiar to those present, since 1563 she has maintained the position that the contrary is "plainly repugnant to the word of God and the custom of the primitive Church." It is necessary, therefore, to consider separately—

¹ This title was allowed to remain in 1563, the present one not being substituted for it till 1571.

1. The evidence of Scripture on this subject.
2. The custom of the primitive Church.

I. *The Evidence of Scripture.*

The only passage in the Bible which can be thought to bear directly upon the subject is 1 Cor. xiv., where S. Paul is speaking of the gift of tongues, and laying down rules for its exercise. His language implies that the "tongue" was ordinarily not intelligible to those present, and he expresses a strong preference for the gift of prophecy, on the ground that it conduces to the edification, comfort, and consolation of those present (ver. 3), whereas the speaker in a tongue speaketh to God only and not to men, "for no man understandeth" (ver. 2). "He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the Church" (ver. 4); and thus, "in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (ver. 19). For this reason he further charges the man that "speaketh in a tongue" to "keep silence in the church, *if there be no interpreter*" (ver. 28). In all this the general principle is laid down that it is right not only to "pray with the spirit," but to "pray with the understanding also," and to "sing with the understanding also," as well as to "sing with the spirit." But it is obviously impossible for this to be done where the service is held "in a tongue not understood of the people." In such a case "the spirit" may "pray," but "the understanding" will be "unfruitful" (ver. 14).

It may be admitted that by the aid of a version in the vernacular, which shall be placed in the hands of the laity, the disadvantages of worship conducted in a dead language may be to some extent obviated. But even so

the broad principle laid down by the Apostle remains untouched: nor does it appear possible that the bulk of the congregation can really join in intelligently unless the language is one that is familiar to them; and however much the idea that the unity of the Church should be expressed by the unity of the language in which her prayers everywhere ascend to God may appeal to us, this is, after all, a matter of *sentiment*, and S. Paul's ruling distinctly places *edification* as the first consideration. We conclude, then, that **it is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God . . . to have public prayer in the Church or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.**

II. *The Custom of the Primitive Church.*

It is also repugnant to **the custom of the primitive Church.** This assertion is scarcely open to question. The evidence of the ancient Liturgies, as well as of incidental statements in the writings of early Fathers,¹ is amply sufficient to prove that as various countries were evangelised, the services of the Church, including the administration of the Sacraments, were held in whatever language was familiar to the people of the country. Thus there still exist Liturgies, not only in Greek, but also in Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, etc.; and it was only in the same way that Latin came to be employed in worship at all, as the general language in use throughout the West.

¹ *E.g.* Origen, *Contra Celsum*, viii. 37: "The Greeks use Greek in their prayers, the Romans Latin, and so everyone in his own language prays to God, and gives thanks as he is able. And He that is Lord of every tongue hears that which is asked in every tongue." Cf. S. Jerome, *Ad Eustoch.*, *Epitaph. Paulæ*. The evidence of the Fathers is set out at length in the Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments, a large part of which is devoted to the consideration of the position maintained in this Article. See the Homilies, p. 378 *seq.* (S.P.C.K.).

Originally the Roman Church was Greek-speaking; and so long as this was the case the Liturgy there used was, not Latin, but *Greek*.¹ But by degrees, as Latin became universal in the West among all classes, so the use of Latin in public worship spread, although it was never adopted in the East. Its retention throughout the Western Church, after the dialects spoken in different quarters had diverged so greatly as to become different languages, as French, Spanish, and Italian, and after the conversion of the Teutonic races and the growth of their several languages, was for a time a real convenience, as Latin was the one language that was generally understood in all parts, and formed the medium of intercourse among educated people. But, as the old order changed, the disadvantages became greater than the advantages, though by a not unnatural conservatism the Church clung tenaciously to what was customary. Then, when the inconveniences were complained of, it was found necessary to justify the existent practice, and arguments were urged in its favour which are clearly afterthoughts, and if seriously pressed would be fatal to the use of Latin, and compel us to revert to the original language in which the Scriptures were written and the Eucharist instituted. But there is no need to enter into these here. Sufficient has been said to justify the position taken up in the Article, and that is all that is required from us.²

¹ A trace of this still remains in the Kyrie Eleison, which has never been translated into Latin, but is still used in its Greek form.

² The formal statement of the Roman Church is, "If anyone shall say that . . . the Mass ought only to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue . . . let him be anathema."—*Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Session XXII. canon ix. This session was held in Sept. 1562, shortly before the revision of the Articles in Elizabeth's reign. It is therefore possible that the alteration then made in the terms of the Article was in consequence of the promulgation of this canon.

ARTICLE XXV

De Sacramentis.

Sacramenta a Christo instituta non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur nostramque fidem in se, non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta, scilicet Baptismus et Cœna Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta, scilicet, Confirmatio, Pœnitentia, Ordo, Matrimonium, et Extrema Unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quæ partim a prava apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim vitæ status sunt in Scripturis quidem probati, sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Cœna Domini rationem non habentes :¹ ut quæ signum aliquod visibile seu cærimoniam a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo, ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur : et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent

Of the Sacraments.

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures ; but yet have not the like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in

¹ The edition of 1563 adds here : " quomodo nec pœnitentia."

effectum: qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

such only as worthily receive the same, have they a wholesome effect or operation. But they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.

THIS Article has undergone considerable alteration since the publication of the series of 1553. In that year it began with a quotation from S. Augustine: "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people, with sacraments most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is Baptism, and the Lord's Supper."¹ Then followed the *last* paragraph of our present Article, with the insertion (after the words "wholesome effect or operation") of the following words: "and yet not that of the work wrought, as some men speak, which word, as it is strange and unknown to Holy Scripture: so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense."² After this paragraph there stood what is now the *first* clause, with which the whole Article was concluded. In 1563 it was brought into the form in which it now stands by means of the following alterations: (1) The quotation from S. Augustine and the clause condemning the theory of grace *ex opere operato* were omitted; (2) the order of the two main paragraphs was reversed; and (3) between them two fresh paragraphs were inserted on (*a*) the number of sacraments ordained

¹ Cf. Augustine, *Epist.* liv.: "Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione præstantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit, sicuti est Baptismus Trinitatis nomine consecratus, communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Ipsius; et si quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur." Cf. also *De Doctr. Christiana*, III. c. ix.

² "Idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato; quæ vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium, sed admodum superstitiosum."

by Christ, and (b) the five rites "commonly called Sacraments."¹

The origin of what now stands as the first clause may be found in the Confession of Augsburg,² from which it was taken through the medium of the thirteen Articles of 1538, where we read: "Docemus, quod Sacramenta quæ per verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sint notæ professionis inter Christianos, sed magis certa quædam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ et bonæ voluntatis Dei erga nos, per quæ Deus invisibiliter operatur in nobis, et suam gratiam in nos invisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus; quodque per ea excitatur et confirmatur fides in his qui eis utuntur. Porro docemus, quod ita utendum sit sacramentis, ut in adultis, præter veram contritionem, necessario etiam debeat accedere fides, quæ credat præsentibus promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta ostenduntur, exhibentur, et præstantur. Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidem dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam *ex opere operato* sine bono motu utentis, nam in ratione utentibus necessarium est, ut fides etiam utentis accedat, per quam credat illis promissionibus, et accipiat res promissas, quæ per sacramenta conferuntur."³ A comparison of this with the corresponding passage in the Confession of Augsburg shows the stronger position on the reality of sacramental grace which the Anglican

¹ The addition may perhaps have been suggested by the fact that the Confession of Württemberg contained a long section on the subject.

² *Conf. Augustana*, art. xiii.: "*De usu Sacramentorum.* De usu Sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita. Itaque utendum est sacramentis, ita ut fides accedat, quæ credat promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operatoificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata."

³ See Hardwick, p. 270.

divines maintained. There is nothing in the purely Lutheran document answering to the “*efficacia signa gratiæ*,” which has been transferred from this unfinished series to our own Article.

The object of the Article is (1) to condemn the inadequate views of sacraments held by the Anabaptists, and to state their true position; (2) to distinguish between the two “Sacraments of the Gospel” and the other five “commonly called Sacraments”; and (3) to insist upon the necessity of a right disposition on the part of the recipients of them. It consists of four paragraphs, treating respectively of the following subjects, which shall be here considered separately:

1. The description of sacraments ordained of Christ.
2. The number of such sacraments.
3. The five rites “commonly called Sacraments.”
4. The use of sacraments.

I. *The Description of Sacraments ordained of Christ.*

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God’s goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.

Each phrase in this description requires careful consideration. Sacraments ordained of Christ are—

(a) **Badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession** (*notæ professionis Christianorum*). This was the regular phrase descriptive of sacraments among the Zwinglians,¹ and adopted also by the Anabaptists,

¹ The language of Zwingli himself sometimes gave to sacraments the lowest position possible. In the *Ratio fidei* he says boldly: “Credo,

who regarded the Eucharist and baptism as *nothing more* than such tokens. So we read in Archbishop Hermann's *Simplex ac pia deliberatio* (which was translated into English in 1547), that they "withdrawe from the sacramentes, which they wil to be nothyng els than outward sygnes of our profession and felowship, as the badges of capitaines be in warre; thei deni that they be workes and ceremonies instituted of God for this purpose; that in them we shulde acknowledge, embrace, and receyve thorough fayth the mercie of God and the merite and communion of Christ; and that God worketh by these signes and exhibiteth unto us the gyftes in dede, which He offereth wyth these signes." ² Similarly, the same view is condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in the following words: "Magna quoque temeritas illorum est, qui sacramenta sic extenuant ut ea pro nudis signis, et externis tantum indiciis capi velint, quibus tanquam notis hominum Christianorum religio possit a cæteris internosci, nec animadvertunt quantum sit scelus, hæc sancta Dei instituta inania et vacua credere." ³ According to this Anabaptist theory, baptism was merely a "mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened," and the Eucharist was nothing more than "a sign of the love that imo scio, omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem aut dispensent" (see Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 24), and elsewhere (*De peccato originali declaratio*): "Symbola igitur sunt externa ista rerum spiritualium et ipsa minime sunt spiritualia, nec quidquam spirituale in nobis perficiunt: sed sunt eorum qui spirituales sunt, quasi tesserae." But his followers were to a great extent influenced by Calvin's teaching, and in the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549) they admit that they are more than "marks or badges of profession." "Sunt quidem et hi sacramentorum fines ut notæ sint ac tesserae Christianæ professionis et societatis sive fraternitatis, ut sint ad gratiarum actionem incitamenta et exercitia fidei ac piæ vitæ, denique syngraphæ ad id obligantes. Sic hic unus inter alia præcipuus ut per ea nobis gratiam suam testetur Deus, representat atque obsignet."—Niemeyer, p. 193.

² English translation (ed. 1548), fol. cxlii.

³ *De Hæres.* c. xvii.

Christians ought to have among themselves one to another." Our Article condemns this view of sacraments as "*notæ professionis*" (not only in the Article before us, but also in XXVII. and XXVIII.), as not in itself untrue, but simply as inadequate. As Hooker says, they are "marks of distinction to separate God's own from strangers." But they are **not only** this. Far more important is it to remember that they are—

(b) **Certain sure witnesses . . . of grace and God's goodwill towards us.** This view of sacraments as "witnesses" (*testimonia*) is one to which special prominence was given by both Lutheran and Calvinistic divines upon the Continent. Sometimes they spoke as if they were witnesses chiefly of *past* mercies, outward acts testifying to God's redeeming love, and assuring us of it in order to excite and confirm our faith in Him.¹ Sometimes, however, they regarded them also as witnesses of *present* blessings, testifying by outward ceremonies to that blessing which the grace annexed to the sacrament confers.² So also our own Hooker speaks of them as "marks *whereby to know when* God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof";³ and, in the Order for

¹ "Baptism testifies that we have been cleansed and washed; the Eucharistic Supper that we have been redeemed."—Calvin's *Institutes*, IV. xiv. 22. "Circumcision is nothing; so is baptism nothing; the communion of the Lord's Supper is nothing: they are rather testimonies and seals of the Divine will towards thee; through them is thy conscience assured, if it ever doubted, of the graciousness and the goodwill of God in thy regard."—Melancthon, quoted by Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 202 (Eng. Tr.). Cf. the 13th Article of the Confession of Augsburg, quoted above, p. 587.

² So the *Apology for the Confession of Augsburg*: "Sacramentum est ceremonia vel opus, in quo Deus nobis exhibet hoc, quod offert annexa ceremoniæ gratia."

³ *Eccles. Polity*, Bk. V. c. lvii.

Holy Communion we are reminded that the holy mysteries are “pledges of His love,” and that by them God “assures us of His favour and goodness towards us.”

But this is not all. They are also to be regarded as—

(c) **Effectual signs of grace** (*efficacia signa*). An “effectual sign” is a sign that carries its effect with it. As the Church Catechism teaches us, it is something more than a mere “pledge.” It is also “a means whereby we receive the same” spiritual grace, of which it is “an outward visible sign.” A sacrament, then, is “not only a picture of grace, but a channel of grace.”¹ It “not only typifies, but conveys.”² As Hooker puts it, the sacraments are “means effectual whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify.”³ This phrase, “effectual signs of grace,” first makes its appearance, as we have already seen, in the incomplete formulary of 1538, and it marks out very clearly the determination of the Anglican Divines to insist upon the truth that the sacraments are real *means of grace*.⁴

(d) By means of these effectual signs God **doth work invisibly in us**. In them “it pleaseth God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible.”⁵ Once more the words seem to have been inserted with the express purpose of laying stress on the reality of the Divine gifts which man

¹ Bp. Alexander.

² Bp. A. Forbes.

³ Hooker, *l.c.*

⁴ The phrase is one which had not commended itself to Luther, and he was only willing to accept it with some qualification. “Nec verum esse potest, sacramentis inesse vim efficacem justificationis, sen esse signa efficacia gratiæ. Hæc enim omnia dicuntur in jacturam fidei, ex ignorantia promissionis diviniæ. Nisi hoc modo efficacia dixeris, quod si adsit fides indubitata, certissime et efficacissime gratiam conferunt.”—*De Capt. Babyl. Ecc. Opp.* vol. ii. fol. 272 (Jenæ, 1600).

⁵ Hooker, *l.c.*

receives from God in and through the sacraments,¹ in which He "embraceth us, and offereth Himself to be embraced by us."²

(e) Lastly, by them God **doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.** In this phrase it appears to be natural to refer the first expression "quicken" (*excitat*) to the action of God's grace in Holy Baptism, and the second, "strengthen and confirm" (*confirmat*), to the action of the same grace in the Eucharist.

We have now gone through the description of sacraments ordained of Christ point by point. But before passing on to consider the next paragraph of the Article, it will be well to cite the definitions given in the Church Catechism and in the Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments, and to compare them with that in the Article before us. If we take the most familiar of them, viz. that in the Catechism, as the standard, and refer the other two to it, it will easily be seen that, though the forms are different, and belong to different dates,³ yet in each case *the same five points are brought out.*

According to the Church Catechism a sacrament is "(1) an outward visible sign of (2) an inward spiritual grace given unto us, (3) ordained by Christ Himself as

¹ These words, as well as "efficacia signa," have nothing corresponding to them in the Confession of Augsburg, being first inserted in the joint Confession of 1538. It is curious, however, to find something very similar to them in the *Confessio Belgica* (1562). "Sunt enim sacramenta signa ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quæ, ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis operatur."—Art. XXXIII. (On this Confession see vol. i. p. 10.)

² *Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments*, p. 376 seq. (S.P.C.K.).

³ The Article to 1553 (or indeed to 1538); the Homily in question to the early years of Elizabeth's reign; the part of the Catechism treating of the sacraments to 1604.

(4) a means whereby we receive the same, and (5) a pledge to assure us thereof."

According to the Homily, sacraments, "according to the exact signification," are "(1) visible signs (3) expressly commanded in the New Testament, (4 and 5) whereunto is annexed the promise of (2) free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining with Christ."¹

To the same effect the Article says that sacraments (3) "ordained of Christ are . . . (5) certain sure witnesses, and (4) effectual (1) signs of (2) grace and God's goodwill towards us, (4) by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

There are, of course, differences of detail, *e.g.* the Homily leaves us free to look for the outward sign anywhere "in the New Testament," whereas the Catechism, with which agrees the Article,² requires it to be ordained "by Christ Himself." The Catechism leaves the nature of the inward spiritual grace undefined. The Homily accurately makes it include, not only pardon, but sanctification and incorporation in Christ. Thus the different descriptions may be regarded as supplementing each other, and for teaching purposes none should be lost sight of.

II. *The Number of Sacraments ordained of Christ.*

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

¹ *Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments*, p. 376 (S.P.C.K.).

² Though the first paragraph does not mention the outward sign as "ordained by Christ Himself," yet the phrases used in the second and third paragraphs, "ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel," and "any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God," indicate agreement with the Catechism on this point.

In considering this statement it will be convenient (*a*) to trace out the history of the word sacrament, and (*b*) to endeavour to set forth the precise difference between England and Rome on the number of the sacraments.

(*a*) *The history of the word sacrament.* — The word *Sacramentum* is a familiar classical one, with two well-defined uses. It means either (1) a gage of money laid down by parties who went to law, or (2) the military oath taken by soldiers to be true to their country and general. The idea which is common to both these meanings is that of a *sacred pledge*. The earliest occurrence of the word in connection with Christianity and Christian associations is in Pliny's famous letter to the Emperor Trajan, in which he says that the Christians of Bithynia bound themselves *sacramento* not to commit any wrong.¹ It may be a matter of doubt to what precisely Pliny was referring, but there can be no doubt that his use of the word "sacrament" is little more than an accident. It can scarcely have been the word which the Bithynian Christians used. In a letter at the beginning of the second century from a Roman governor to a Roman emperor the word can only be interpreted in its classical sense of an oath or obligation. Ecclesiastical Latin was not yet in existence: indeed, it is almost certain that there was as yet no Latin-speaking Church; and thus, though it is interesting to find the word employed in connection with a Christian rite, yet later associations which have grown up round it must not be suffered to influence our interpretation of it. As an ecclesiastical term, its true home is *North Africa*, which

¹ Pliny, *Epist.* xcvi.: "Affirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque *sacramento* non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent." See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. II, vol. i. p. 51.

was the first Latin-speaking Church. Here we find it used from the first as the equivalent of the Greek *μυστήριον*, and as such it is employed with a wide latitude of meaning, for either a religious rite or a religious truth; generally, however, with the idea that some sacred meaning lies under a visible sign. So Tertullian (200) uses the word again and again, sometimes of the military oath,¹ sometimes of a sacred truth, or a mystery, sometimes of a sacred rite, and even of the rite of infanticide with which the Christians were charged.² Similarly with Cyprian (250) it means a sacred symbol, a sacred bond, or a sacred truth.³ From North Africa the word passed into the common language and familiar speech of Western Christendom through the Latin versions of the Scripture, in which it appears in several passages always as the rendering of *μυστήριον*.⁴ In Patristic writers the same latitude in the use of the term, which has been already noticed, may constantly be

¹ *De Spectaculis*, xxiv. *Scorpiace*, iv.

² See *Apol.* vii. (*Sacramentum infanticidii*); xv. (*Sacramenti nostri*); xix. (*Judaici Sacramenti*); xlvii. (*nostris Sacramentis*); *Adv. Marc.* V. viii. (*panis et calicis Sacramento*); *De Bapt.* i. (*aquæ Sacramentum*), etc.

³ Cyprian uses it twice of the military oath: *De lapsis*, xiii.; *Ep.* lxxiv. Elsewhere with wide latitude of meaning. Of Baptism, *Ep.* lxxiii.; of the Eucharist, *De zelo et livore*, xvii., *De lapsis*, xxv.; of the Passover, *De unitate*, viii.; of a sacred bond, *Ep.* lix., *De unitate*, vi. etc.; of doctrines, *De Dominica Oratione*, ix., *Testim. Prof.* etc. See the very careful note on his use of the word, which was "in many instances used with intentional vagueness," in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. iv. p. 253.

⁴ "Sacramentum" appears in the Vulgate (1) in the Old Testament in Dan. ii. 18, 30, 47, iv. 6 (A.V. 9), each time as the equivalent of *סֵּגֶר*, a secret (Greek *μυστήριον*); and also in Tobit xii. 7; Wisd. ii. 22, vi. 24 (A.V. 22); in all of which places it represents the same Greek word, *μυστήριον*, as it does also (2) in the eight passages in which it is found in the New Testament, viz. Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, 9, v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. i. 20, xvii. 7. It is also found occasionally in other passages in the "Old Latin," e.g. in Rom. xvi. 25.

observed. It is used frequently of sacred truths, as well as of sacred rites of mystic meaning. Even as late as the eleventh century it is applied by S. Bernard to the rite of feet washing.¹ But in comparatively early times there had been a tendency to contrast the sacraments or sacred rites of the Jews with those of the Christian Church, and to point to the former as numerous and burdensome, and the latter as few in number. Thus Augustine, in the passage quoted in the original Article of 1553, says that "under the new dispensation our Lord Jesus Christ has knit together His people in fellowship, by sacraments which are very few in number, most easy in observance, and most excellent in significance, as baptism solemnised in the name of the Trinity, the Communion of His Body and Blood, and also whatever else is commended to us in Canonical Scripture, apart from those enactments which were a yoke of bondage to God's ancient people, suited to their state of heart and to the times of the prophets, and which are found in the books of Moses."² Elsewhere in his book on Christian Doctrine he draws a similar contrast, pointing out how "our Lord Himself and apostolic practice have handed down to us a few significant rites (*signa*) in place of many, and these at once very easy to perform, most majestic in their significance, and most sacred in their observance. Such as the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Celebration of the Body and Blood of the Lord."³ From this contrast between the multiplicity of sacred rites imposed upon the Jews and the fewness of those enjoined in the gospel to Christians, there grew up in time a disposition to use the word *sacramentum* more particularly of those rites which could claim the authority of the New Testament, and to speak of the "Sacraments

¹ *Sermo in Cena Domini*, § 24.

² See above, p. 586.

³ *De Doctrina Christiana*, III. ix.

of the Church " as limited in number. So in the East, "Dionysius the Areopagite" (c. 500), who is followed by later writers, describes in his book on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchies *sic* Christian *μυστήρια*, Baptism, the Eucharist, Unction, Orders, Monastic Profession, and the Rites for the Dead. In the West, Paschasius Radbert¹ and Rhabanus Maurus,² in the ninth century, both speak of *four* sacraments, Baptism, Unction, the Body, and the Blood of the Lord. Not till the eleventh century is the number fixed at the mystic number *seven*, to correspond with the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit. The earliest writer to speak of this number (so far as is known) is Gregory of Bergamo,³ in his book, *De Eucharistia*. In this he says definitely that the sacraments of the Church instituted by our Saviour were *seven*;⁴ but in the next chapter he speaks of *three*, Baptism, Unction, and the Eucharist, as more worthy, and contradicts what he has said before, by maintaining that of these three, only the first and third were instituted by the Redeemer Himself, for unction has only apostolic authority.⁵ A few years later than Gregory was Peter Lombard,⁶ to whom it is generally stated that

¹ *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, iii. 2.

² *De Clericorum Institutione*, I. xxiv.

³ Gregory became Bishop of Bergamo in 1133, and died in 1146. His book, *De Eucharistia*, was first published in 1877, and since then has been included in Hurter's *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta*, vol. xxxix.

⁴ *De Euch.* c. xiii.: "Verum ne quis occasione dictorum existimet tot esse sacramenta ecclesiæ, quot sunt quibus congruit sacramenti vocabulum, scire debemus ea solum esse ecclesiæ sacramenta a servatore nostro Jesu instituta quæ in medicinam nobis tributa fuere, et hæc numero adimplentur septenario."

⁵ *De Euch.* c. xiv.: "Tria siquidem in ecclesia gerimus sacramenta quæ sacramentis aliis putantur non immerito digniora, scilicet baptismum, chrisma, corpus et sanguis Domini. Quorum trium primum et ultimum ex ipsius Redemptoris institutione percepimus, ex apostolica vero traditione illud quod medium posuimus."

⁶ Peter Lombard became Bishop of Paris in 1159, and died in 1164.

the limitation of the number to seven is due. It is found in his writings,¹ and it was probably through his influence that it became generally accepted. From him it passed into the writings of the schoolmen, Aquinas² and others. It was laid down in the "decree to the Armenians" sent in the name of Pope Eugenius iv. from the Council of Florence (1439);³ and was definitely adopted by the Council of Trent at the seventh session of the Council (1547), when the following canon was passed: "If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that they are more or less than seven, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, or Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament: let him be anathema."⁴ It will be seen from this brief sketch that our Reformers had a double use of the word before them. On the one hand, there was the wider sense given to it by the Fathers; on the other, the more restricted scholastic use. They

¹ *Sentent.* IV. dist. ii. § 1.

² *Summa*, III. Q. lxv.

³ *Decretum Eugenii Papæ IV. ad Armenios*, Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix. pp. 434 and 437.

⁴ *Conc. Trid.* Sess. VII. canon 1: "Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, et Matrimonium, aut etiam aliquod horum septem, non esse vere, et proprie sacramentum, anathema sit." It should be mentioned that the Greek Church agrees with the Roman in reckoning the sacraments of the Church as seven in number; for though the Confession of Cyril Lucar says that only two sacraments were ordained of Christ (c. xv., see Kimmel's *Libri Symbolici*, p. 34), the "Orthodox Confession recognises the ἐπὶ τὰ μυστήρια τῆς ἐκκλησίας (q. xeviii. *ib.* p. 170 *seq.*), as does also the Confession of Dositheos (*Decret.* xv. *ib.* p. 448); and see also "the Longer Catechism of the Russian Church" (Blackmore's *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, p. 84). The Confession of Metrophanes Critopulus calls Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀναγκαῖα μυστήρια. See Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 241.

recognised frankly that it was largely a question of definition. What they were concerned for was that Baptism and the Eucharist, as the two great rites ordained for all Christians by Christ Himself, should be put on a different footing from all others.¹ The medieval teaching about the seven sacraments might seem to obscure this; and therefore they felt that if the word was to be restricted to a limited number of rites, it would be well to restrict it to these two. But they

¹ According to the teaching of the earlier period, during the Reformation *three* sacraments were recognised as pre-eminent, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance. These alone are mentioned in the Ten Articles of 1536, while in the "Institution of a Christian Man," or "the Bishops' Book," issued in the following year, they are expressly separated off from the others, and it is said that "although the sacraments of Matrimony, of Confirmation, of Holy Orders, and of Extreme Unction have been of long time past received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church to have the name and dignity of sacraments, as indeed they are well worthy to have . . . yet there is a difference in dignity and necessity between them and the other three sacraments, that is to say, the sacraments of Baptism, of Penance, and of the Altar, and that for divers causes," etc.—See *Formularies of Faith*, p. 128. In 1540 a series of questions was propounded, probably by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to a number of Bishops and Divines, and their answers revealed a great variety of opinions on the number of the sacraments, and the proper use of the word (see the answers in Burnet, "Records," Nos. xxi. and lxix., and cf. Dixon, vol. ii. p. 303 *seq.*). Cranmer and others denied that it should be rigidly used of seven. However, in the reactionary "King's Book" of 1543 the whole passage on the number of sacraments in the Bishops' Book is entirely rewritten, and the medieval view is more rigidly adhered to (see *Formularies of Faith*, p. 293). In the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, as might be expected, a great change of view is manifest, as the following extract will show: "Ad sacramenti perfectionem tria concurrere debent. Primum evidens est et illustris nota, quæ manifeste cerni possit, secundum est Dei promissum, quod externo signo nobis representatur et plane confirmatur. Tertium est Dei præceptum quo necessitas nobis imponitur, ista partim faciendi, partim commemorandi: quæ tria cum autoritate Scripturarum in Baptismo solum occurrant, et Eucharistia, nos hæc duo sola pro veris et propriis novi testamenti sacramentis ponimus."—*De Sacramentis*, c. ii. Similarly in the Catechism published with the Articles in 1553, only two sacraments are expressly recognised.

were perfectly willing to extend it to other rites also—indeed, to “anything whereby an holy thing is signified”—provided that it was made clear that the word was only used in a general sense. Thus the Article before us, after speaking of the five rites, “commonly called Sacraments,”¹ proceeds, not to deny the name to them altogether, but only to assert that they “have not the *like* nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper,” *i.e.* they are not to be put on a level with them. Still clearer, perhaps, is the teaching of the Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments, which puts the matter so admirably that the passage must be quoted here in full.

“As for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a sacrament, namely for visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And though the ordering of ministers hath His visible

¹ It cannot be said that this expression discourages the application of the name to them, any more than it can be maintained that the parallel form of expression in the Prayer Book, “The Nativity of our Lord, or the Birthday of Christ, *commonly called* Christmas Day,” discourages the use of the popular name for the festival.

sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other sacraments except the two above named do. Therefore neither it, nor any other sacrament else, be such sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in a general acceptation the name of a sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments; but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments in the same signification that the two forenamed Sacraments are. *Dionysius; Bernard, De Cæna Domini, et Ablut. pedum.*"¹

It is perfectly clear from this that *in some sense* other sacraments are recognised by those who are responsible for the Homilies besides the two great ones, Baptism and the Communion.

We are now in a position to pass to the consideration of the next point:

(b) *The precise difference between England and Rome on the number of the sacraments.*—It is largely but not entirely a question of definition—not entirely, for, even admitting the Roman description of sacraments, we could not accept the Tridentine statement upon them. The real difference appears to be this: Rome says that the sacraments of the new law are *neither more nor less than seven*, and that they were *all* instituted by Christ. The Anglican Church maintains that the word should either be restricted to *two* rites with outward visible signs ordained by Christ Himself,² or else that sacraments are

¹ *Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments*, p. 376 seq. (S.P.C.K.).

² It must be remembered that the statement of the Catechism, "Two

not seven, but innumerable. Two points in the Roman position may be added, as they are sometimes overlooked. *First*, though the Tridentine divines have committed the Roman Church to the position that all the seven sacraments were instituted by Christ Himself,¹ yet they have never asserted that in every case the outward visible sign is of His institution; *secondly*, they asserted definitely that all the seven are not to be regarded as exactly on the same level of equality. "If anyone shall say that these seven sacraments are equal to each other in such wise as that one is not in any way more worthy than another: let him be anathema."² When these two points are remembered, it will be found that the difference between the two branches of the Church on this matter is comparatively small.

III. *The five Rites "commonly called Sacraments."*

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that

only as generally necessary to salvation," is not made in answer to the question, "How many sacraments are there?" but "How many sacraments *hath* Christ ordained in His Church?" Moreover it is not said absolutely that these are "two only," but "two only as *generally* necessary for salvation," *i.e.* as necessary for all men. Cf. Taylor's *Dissuasive from Popery*, p. 240. "It is none of the doctrine of the Church of England that there are two sacraments only; but that of those rituals commanded in Scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls sacraments (by a word of art), two only are generally necessary to salvation." So Archbp. Secker in his *Lectures* (xxxv.), "Our Catechism doth not require it to be said absolutely that the sacraments are *two only*, but two only necessary to salvation, leaving persons at liberty to comprehend more things under the name if they please, provided that they insist not on the necessity of them, and of dignifying them with this title."

¹ Before the Council of Trent it was regarded as an open question whether they were all instituted by Christ; and some divines, as Bonaventura, Hugo, and Durandus, have questioned whether Confirmation and Unction were instituted by Him.

² *Conc. Trident.* Sess. VII. canon iii.

is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles (a *prava apostolorum imitatione*), partly are states of life allowed (*probati*) in the Scriptures: but yet have not the like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

It cannot be said that the account given in this paragraph of the five rites is quite exact. It is said that they are (1) **such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles**, *i.e.* from a bad imitation of them, a *prava apostolorum imitatione*. This would well apply, as will be shown below, to Extreme Unction, and perhaps also is intended to refer to Penance in its medieval form, in view of the superstitions connected with it. (2) They are **partly states of life allowed in the Scriptures**. "Allowed," it must be remembered, meant a good deal more in the sixteenth century than it does now. It did not stand for "permitted," but was equivalent to "approved of" (Latin, *probati*).¹ Thus "states of life allowed in the Scriptures" involves no lack of appreciation of the rites so described. The phrase may be taken to refer to Matrimony and Holy Orders, both of which can be spoken of as "states of life." But it cannot include Confirmation, which is

¹ So in Art. XXXV. of 1553 it is said that the "Book of prayers and ceremonies of the Church of England" ought to be received and *allowed* (*approbandi*). In XXXVI. of the same series, that "the civil magistrate is ordained and *allowed* (*probatus*) of God." A similar use of the word is found in the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer: "He favourably *alloweth* this charitable work of ours"; and cf. Ps. xi. 6 (P.B.V. "the Lord *alloweth* the righteous"), and S. Luke xi. 48, 1 Thess. ii. 4 in the A.V.

not a "state of life" at all. Nor does it seem probable that this apostolic ordinance, which the Church of England has always maintained and insisted upon, can be included under the first head.¹ It remains, then, that the description is somewhat carelessly drawn, and that one of the five rites is not really included in it. This, however, is not a matter of great importance, for **Confirmation**, equally with the others, fails to answer to the description of "Sacraments of the Gospel"; for although it is an apostolic rite, with its "outward visible sign" and its "inward spiritual grace," yet as it is only traceable to the Acts of the Apostles (see Acts viii. 17, xix. 6, and cf. Heb. vi. 2), we cannot positively say that it was "ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel," or that it has an "outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself."

It will also be found that each of the other rites fails to answer to the restricted definition. **Penance**, of which absolution is the "form in which its chief force consists,"² most certainly was "ordained by Christ Himself" (see S. John xx. 23), but it cannot honestly be said to have "any visible sign or ceremony ordained of

¹ It is *possible*, however, as Dr. Mason thinks, that Confirmation is intended to be described as having grown out of "the corrupt following of the apostles," since "in the official language of the time, Confirmation meant distinctly the rite of unction, after a certain form, with a chrism elaborately compounded." See "The relation of Confirmation to Baptism," p. 426. I cannot, however, think that this view is probable, since "Confirmation" had been deliberately retained as the official title of the rite of laying on of hands in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559. It is curious to notice that at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, the Puritans complained that this phrase in the Articles involved a contradiction with the teaching of the Prayer Book, and that their complaint was dismissed as a "mere cavil." Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 182.

² *Conc. Trid.* Sess. XIV. cap. iii.: "Docet præterea sancta synodus sacramenti pœnitentiæ formam, in qua præcipue ipsius vis sita est, in illis ministri verbis positam esse: Ego te absolvo," etc.

God." **Orders**, again, was "ordained by Christ Himself" on the same occasion (S. John xx. 21-23). It has its "inward spiritual grace," and from the days of the Apostles has had as its "outward visible sign" the laying on of hands. But once more the outward visible sign cannot be traced back to the Gospel, or to our Lord's own ordinance. Moreover, the grace given in it is official, rather than for the personal sanctification of the recipient. **Matrimony** is "an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church"; and though "Christ adorned and beautified" it "with His Presence,"¹ it cannot be said that it was ordained of Him in the Gospel, nor has it any "outward visible sign" of Divine appointment.² **Extreme Unction** may seem to require further consideration; for whereas the other four rites are retained and "had in reverend estimation" by the Church of England, this one has been entirely disused, and no authority whatever is given for the application of oil to the sick by the formularies of this branch of the Church. The Scriptural authority that is pleaded for the rite is, of course, the injunction of S. James in his Epistle.

"Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders

¹ The Book of Common Prayer. The Order for the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony.

² In Eph. v. 32, after speaking of the union in marriage, S. Paul says τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, which is rendered by the Vulgate "Sacramentum hoc magnum est," and consequently by the Douay version, "This is a great sacrament." It is, however, perfectly obvious that the Apostle's use of the word μυστήριον in this connection ("This mystery is great," R.V.) has no real bearing on the question whether marriage is a "sacrament" in the later technical sense of the word, though, as Bishop Ellicott notes (*in loc.*), the very fact of the comparison which the Apostle makes ("but I am speaking in reference to Christ and His Church") "does place marriage on a far holier and higher basis than modern theories are disposed to admit."

of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him" (v. 14, 15).¹ It may be granted that this looks very much like an injunction to the Church for all time; but even so, if this were allowed, it would not give the unction a right to be regarded as a Sacrament of the Gospel, for it is not "ordained by Christ Himself." We find, however, in the writings of early Fathers so remarkable and complete a silence upon the subject that we can only conclude that it was not regarded by them as enjoining a rite to be continued after the *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων* (1 Cor. xii. 9) had disappeared from the Church. There is, indeed, a constant stream of testimony to the use of oil for healing purposes by Christians in early ages;² but there is no evidence for its application as a religious rite until we come to the well-known letter of Innocent I. to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, early in the fifth century. Decentius had written to ask whether the bishop might anoint the sick. Innocent replies, and, referring to the passage in S. James, tells him that he might do so, that the oil should be blessed by the bishop and used by all Christians in their hour of need, and that it is "a kind of sacrament."³ Now, even if it be

¹ The only other passage in the New Testament where such unction can possibly be referred to is S. Mark vi. 13, where it is said that the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them"; but this is so definitely *for healing*, that it is not generally regarded by Roman divines as "the sacrament of Unction."

² *E.g.* Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, c. iv.; *Vita Eugeniae*, c. xi. (Rosweyd, 343).

³ *Ep. ad Decent.* § 8: "Sane quoniam de hoc, sicuti de cæteris, consulere voluit dilectio tua . . . quod in beati apostolis Jacobi epistola conscriptum est: *Si infirmus aliquis in vobis est*, etc.: quod non est dubium de fidelibus ægrotantibus accipi vel intelligi debere, qui sancta oleo chrismatis perungi possunt, quod ab episcopo confectum, non solum

admitted that the letter is genuine, it is clear that it is fatal to any claim for this religious unction to be regarded as *primitive*; for, as Bishop Harold Browne truly says, "If extreme unction were then a sacrament of the Church, it is impossible that one bishop should have asked this question of another; or if he did, that the other should not at once have reminded him that it was a well-known sacrament of immemorial usage."¹ Further, it appears from the letter that even when the blessing of the oil was restricted to the bishop, it was still regarded as immaterial by whom the unction was administered;² nor do we meet with any injunction to the priest to administer it himself *before the ninth century*.

Again, whereas the original intention of the unction had been primarily for the saving of the sick person's life, by degrees this dropped out of sight, and the rite came to be regarded as part of the preparation for death, and was only administered when all hope of recovery seemed to have passed away; and thus that

sacerdotibus, sed et omnibus uti Christianis licet, in sua aut in suorum necessitate unguendum. Cæterum illud superfluum esse videmus adjectum, ut de episcopo ambigatur, quod presbyteris licere non dubium est. Nam idcirco presbyteris dictum est, quia episcopi occupationibus aliis impediti, ad omnes languidos ire non possunt. Cæterum si episcopus aut potest aut dignum ducit, aliquem a se visitandum, et benedicere et tangere chrismate, sine cunctatione potest, cujus est chrisma conficere. Nam pœnitentibus istud infundi non potest, quia genus est sacramenti. Nam quibus reliqua sacramenta negantur, quomodo unum genus putatur posse concedi?"

¹ *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 588.

² Even after the days of Innocent I. the oil was frequently blessed by laymen, and even *women*. Thus S. Monegund (570) on her deathbed "blessed oil and salt," which were afterwards given to the sick; see Greg. Turon. *Vita Patrum*, c. xix. In 813 the Council of Chalons lays down that the sick ought to be anointed by the presbyters with oil which is blessed by the bishop (canon xlviii.). To the same effect, Hinemar (852), *Capit.* 5, and others about the same time. See the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 2004.

which had been originally simply "the last unction" (*extrema unctio*), as being (presumably) applied after the unctions in Baptism and Confirmation, came to be looked upon as nothing but "*unctio in extremis*," and was deferred until death seemed imminent. The subject was considered by the Council of Trent at its fourteenth Session, in 1551, when it was laid down that "this sacred unction of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord, as truly and properly a sacrament of the new law, hinted at, indeed, in Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the apostle and brother of the Lord." The unction was said to "represent the grace of the Holy Ghost with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed." The "effect of this sacrament" was further said to be "the grace of the Holy Ghost, whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, and the remains of sin; relieves and strengthens the soul of the sick, by exciting in him a great confidence in the Divine mercy, whereby the sick being relieved, bears more easily the inconveniences and pain of sickness; and more readily resists the temptations of the devil, who lies in wait for his heel;¹ and sometimes obtains bodily health, when it is expedient for the welfare of his soul." It is also said that "this unction is to be applied to the sick, but especially to those who lie in such danger as to seem placed at their departure from this life: whence also it is called the sacrament of the dying." But it is added that "if the sick should recover, after having received this unction, they may again be aided by the succour of this sacrament when they fall into another like danger of death."² These quotations show how far the Roman

¹ The reference is to the Vulgate of Gen. iii. 15.

² *Conc. Trid.* Sess. XIV., *Doctrina de sacramento extremæ unctionis*, cap. i.-iii.

use has departed from the intention of the rite described by S. James, and how what was originally a practice enjoined for *life* has become a "sacrament of the dying," only administered at the present day after the Viaticum has been received.¹ Turning now to the consideration of the practice in the Church of England, it may be noticed that the "Bishops' Book" of 1537 contains a section devoted to the subject in which various abuses and superstitions connected with the rite are noticed,² though the practice is retained, and men are to be taught to repute it "among the other sacraments of the Church." But it is clearly stated that "the grace conferred in this sacrament is the relief and recovery of the disease and sickness wherewith the sick person is then diseased and troubled, and also the remission of his sins if he be then in sin."³ All this passage was considerably modified in the "King's Book" of 1543, which refers far less to the prospect of restoration to bodily health, and is, as might be expected, decidedly more medieval in tone.⁴ When the first English Prayer Book was pub-

¹ It is clear from the language of S. Thomas that in the thirteenth century extreme unction was administered *before* the Eucharist was given to the sick, for he says: "Per pœnitentiam et extremam unctionem præparatur homo ad digne sumendum corpus Christi."—*Summa*, III. Q. lxy. art. 3.

² "No man ought to think that by receiving of this sacrament of anointing the sick man's life shall be made shorter, but rather that the same shall be prolonged thereby,—considering the same is instituted for the recovery of health both of the soul and body. Second, that it is an evil custom to defer the administration of this sacrament unto such time as the sick persons be brought by sickness unto extreme peril and jeopardy of life, and be in manner in despair to live any longer. Thirdly, that it is lawful and expedient to administer this said sacrament unto every good Christian man in the manner and form before rehearsed, so oft and whensoever any great and perilous sickness and malady shall fortune unto them."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 127.

³ *Ib.* p. 125.

⁴ See *Formularies of Faith*, pp. 123–128 and 290–293.

lished in 1549, a simple form of anointing was provided to be used "if the sick person desire it." It was, however, entirely omitted in the Second Prayer Book in 1552, and has never been restored. If any justification be needed for this complete disuse of the practice, it may reasonably be found in the absence of any early authority for it, and the entire lack of evidence from early writers that the words of S. James were regarded as enjoining a rite to be of lasting obligation in the Church.

IV. *The use of Sacraments.*

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly (rite) use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same have they a wholesome effect or operation. But they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.

There is a slight difficulty concerning the first words used here, because Baptism cannot possibly be "carried about," nor does there appear ever to have been any superstitious practice of "gazing upon" it. The custom of carrying about the Eucharist is referred to again in Article XXVIII., and it is easy to see that, in view of the superstitions of the day, it may well have been thought necessary to point out that this holy sacrament **was not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about;** and the probability is that the words are intended to refer specially to it.¹ This inter-

¹ Britton (*Horæ Sacramentales*, p. 97 *seq.*) argues that the plural "sacraments" may have been intended to refer to the two parts of the Eucharist which are spoken of in the Prayer Books of 1552 and 1559 as the *Sacraments* of His Blessed Body and Blood" (second exhortation to come to the Holy Communion). The word is altered into the singular in the edition of 1604.

pretation is confirmed by the fact that S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi. 29, to which allusion is made in the following sentence, are spoken only of the Eucharist.

It will scarcely be denied that the medieval system was exposed to serious danger of leading men to rest content with the mechanical act of receiving the sacraments, and of encouraging them to look on them almost as magical charms. Hence it was well that it should be definitely stated **that we should duly use them, and that in such only as worthily receive the same have they a wholesome effect or operation.** But it would seem superfluous to add proof of these statements here, for no Christian will be found to deny them.

With regard to the last words of the Article, which state that **they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith,** it will be sufficient to remind the reader that the "damnation" spoken of here and in the Authorised Version of 1 Cor. xi. 29 (the passage alluded to), is not necessarily final condemnation. It is rather that "judgment" with which "we are chastened of the Lord, *that we may not be condemned with the world*" (ver. 32); *i.e.* the Apostle is speaking of a temporal chastisement, the object of which was to wean the unworthy communicant from his sin, and lead him to repentance, so that he might escape what is commonly called "damnation." The mistranslation, which is found in the Book of Common Prayer, as well as in the Articles and the Authorised Version, has happily been altered in the Revised Version of 1881. It may be said in extenuation of it that "damnation" was by no means so strong a term in the sixteenth century as it is now;¹ but all the same the rendering of *κρίμα* as "judicium" by the

¹ See Wright's *Bible Word Book*, p. 181.

Vulgate in the passage in question ought to have prevented the mistranslation, the practical consequences of which have certainly been serious.

A few words may be added in conclusion concerning the doctrine of grace *ex opere operato*, for it will be remembered that the phrase was expressly condemned in the clause corresponding to that now under consideration, in the Article of 1553. It may therefore be fairly asked, why was the condemnation of it removed in 1563? Does the Church of England hold the doctrine, or does it not? In answer to this it may be pointed out that the phrase was an ambiguous one, capable of a perfectly innocent sense, and of expressing a real truth, but capable also of a meaning which was grossly superstitious. It was originally used by medieval Theologians, and after them by the Council of Trent (Session VII. canon viii.), to describe the nature of the effects which the "seven sacraments" produce. In the technical language of the schools, man can by his perversity and wilful hardness "put a bar" (*ponere obicem*) against their effect,¹ and certain dispositions, as faith and repentance, are required on the part of the recipient. But the grace comes not from them, but from Christ Himself through the sacraments of His institution; for, as our own Article XXVI. points out, the sacraments are "effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be administered by evil men." It was to guard this truth that the phrase that grace comes *ex opere operato* was invented; and it was intended to indicate that "grace

¹ Cf. the answer of the bishops at the Savoy Conference in 1661 to the objection of the Puritans to the statement that every child is regenerate in Baptism. "Seeing that God's sacraments have their effects where the receiver doth not 'ponere obicem,' put any bar against them (which children cannot do); we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit."—Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 356.

is conferred by virtue of the sacramental act instituted by God for this end, not by the merits of the minister or the recipient.”¹ But while, as employed by careful and instructed Theologians, the phrase meant nothing more than this, yet in the mouths of ignorant and ill-instructed persons it was easily capable of “no godly but a very superstitious sense,” and might be taken to imply that the grace was so tied to the sacraments that the sacramental act became almost of the nature of a magical charm, bringing grace to the recipient *ex opere operato*, whatever his spiritual condition might be.² It was this which led to the condemnation of the phrase in 1553. But by the time of the revision of 1563 it had been made abundantly clear that this superstitious use was not the only one which the phrase conveyed. Consequently there was a danger lest the language of the

¹ So Bellarmine (*De Sacram.* ii. 1) explains it: “Id quod active et proxime atque instrumentaliter efficit gratiam justificationis est sola actio illa externa, quæ sacramentum dicitur, et hæc vocatur *opus operatum*, accipiendo passive (operatum), ita ut idem sit sacramentum conferre gratiam ex opere operato, quod conferre gratiam ex vi ipsius actionis sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex merito agentis vel suscipientis. . . . Voluntas, fides, et pœnitentia in suscipiente adulto necessario requiruntur ut dispositiones ex parte subjecti, non ut causæ activæ, non enim fides et pœnitentia efficiunt gratiam sacramentalem neque dant efficaciam sacramenti, sed solum tollunt obstacula, quæ impedirent, ne sacramenta suam efficaciam exercere possent, unde in pueris, ubi non requiritur dispositio, sine his rebus fit justificatio.” And, among moderns, see the careful statement of Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 198.

² This superstitious sense is indicated in the language of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, where the phrase is condemned (Art. IX.): “Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato *sine bono motu utentis*, nam in ratione utentibus necessarium est ut fides etiam utentis accedat, per quam credat illis promissionibus et accipiat res promissas quæ per sacramenta conferantur.” So in the “Apology for the Confession of Augsburg”: “Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum qui docent quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato *sine bono motu utentis*.” Winer’s *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 246.

Article might appear to condemn a real truth. Hence the clause was wisely omitted by Archbishop Parker,¹ and nothing whatever was said either to sanction or to condemn the phrase. The superstition which it was desired to guard against was effectually excluded by the statement that "in such only as duly receive" the sacraments "have they a wholesome effect or operation"; while the truth which the phrase had been originally intended to express was secured by the language of the following Article, which states "that they are effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be administered by evil men."

¹ Cf. Hardwick, pp. 129, 130.

ARTICLE XXVI

*De vi Institutionum Divinarum,
quod eam non tollit malitia
Ministorum.*

Quamvis in ecclesia visibili bonis mali semper sint admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et sacramentorum administrationi præsint, tamen cum non suo sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et autoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, quæ propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos ministrantur.

Ad ecclesiæ tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusenturque ab his, qui eorum flagitia noverint, atque tandem justo convicti judicio deponantur.

*Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers,
which hinders not the effect of the
Sacraments.*

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometime the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receiving of the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.

THIS Article has remained practically unchanged ¹ since

¹ "Malos ministros" was substituted for "eos" in the last paragraph in 1563, and in 1571 the English was brought into conformity with the

its first issue in 1553. It is drawn substantially from the fifth of the "Thirteen Articles of 1538,"¹ which in its turn rested to some extent on the eighth of the Confession of Augsburg.² Its object is to condemn the view maintained by the Anabaptists, that the ministry of evil ministers is necessarily inefficacious and ought to be rejected. The same view is expressly condemned in the Confession of Augsburg in the following words: "Damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse."³ Similarly the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* says that some of the Anabaptists "ab ecclesiæ corpore seipsos segregant, et ad sacrosanctam Domini mensam cum aliis recusant accedere, seque dicunt detineri vel ministrorum improbitate vel aliorum fratrum."⁴

Latin by the alteration of "such" into "evil ministers." The title also in its present form only dates from 1571. In 1553 and 1563 it was "the wickedness of the ministers doth not take away the effectual operation of God's ordinances." "Ministrorum malitia non tollit efficaciam institutionum divinarum."

¹ "Quamvis in ecclesia secundum posteriorem acceptionem mali sint bonis admixti atque etiā ministeriis verbi et sacramentorum non nunquam præsint; tamen cum ministrent non suo sed Christi nomine, mandato, et auctoritate, licet eorum ministerio uti, tam in verbo audiendo quam in recipiendis sacramentis juxta illud: 'Qui vos audit me audit.' Nec per eorum malitiam minuitur effectus, aut gratia donorum Christi rite accipientibus; sunt enim efficacia propter promissionem et ordinationem Christi, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."

² "Quanquam ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium; tamen cum in hac vita multi hypocritæ et mali admixti sint, licet uti sacramentis, quæ per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi: *Sedent Scribæ et Pharisei in Cathedra Moisis*, etc. Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."

³ *Confessio Augustana*, Art. VIII. *sub fine*.

⁴ *Ref. Legum Ecclesiast.*, De Hæres. c. xv. Cf. Rogers *On the Articles* (published in 1586). "The Anabaptists will not have the people to use the ministry of evil ministers, and think the service of wicked ministers

It has been sometimes thought that the Article may have also been aimed at the doctrine of "Intention."¹ This, however, is unquestionably a mistake. The language of the Article in no way bears on the doctrine, and it is difficult to see how it could ever have been thought to do so. Certainly when the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 asked that a condemnation of the doctrine might be inserted in the Articles, it cannot have occurred either to them or to the Bishops who answered them that a condemnation of it was there already.² Moreover, when in 1633 Francis a Sancta Clara (Davenport) wrote his Commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles, endeavouring to reconcile them with the Tridentine decrees, while some of the statements in the Articles were evidently stubborn facts which it was hard to manipulate, the Article before us gave him no trouble whatever. It appeared to him entirely satisfactory, and the only comment which he deemed necessary upon it was this: "This is the very doctrine of the Church and of all the Fathers."³

Taking, then, the Article as aimed solely against the notions of the Anabaptists, it needs but little comment

unprofitable and not effectual; affirming that no man who is himself faulty can preach the truth to others. . . . The disciplinary Puritans do bring all ministers who cannot preach, and their services, into detestation. For their doctrine is that where there is no preacher, there ought to be no minister of the sacraments. None must minister the sacraments which do not preach, etc. . . . So the Brownists: no man is to communicate (say they) where there is a blind or dumb ministry." Rogers *On the Thirty-Nine Articles* (Parker Society), p. 271.

¹ See Bishop Harold Browne *On the Articles*, p. 607.

² Cf. Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 185.

³ Davenport's book, which is more remarkable for ingenuity than for anything else, has been republished by the Rev. F. G. Lee (J. T. Hayes, 1872).

or explanation.¹ The opinions condemned in it, which have found favour with Puritan sects from the days of the Donatists onward, would, if admitted, make all ministerial and sacramental acts utterly uncertain, for no man can see into the hearts of the ministers, and say who are in the sight of God "evil" and who are not. Besides this, there is ample support in Holy Scripture for the position maintained in the Article. The principle underlying our Lord's words, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all things, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe; but do not ye after their works" (S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), may fairly be applied to the case of "evil ministers" in the Christian Church. When the Twelve were sent forth two and two, and given "power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease," the ministry of Judas must have been effectual like that of the rest of the Apostles, or suspicion would have been directed towards him. Again, our Lord lays down the rule with regard to "the Seventy" which must apply to Christian ministers also: "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth Me; and he that rejecteth Me, rejecteth Him that sent Me" (S. Luke x. 16); and S. Paul teaches that the minister is nothing. "What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him. I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase" (1 Cor. iii. 5, 6). Such passages when fairly considered seem sufficient to establish the position taken up in the Article, and to lead us to believe that even in an extreme case, when **the evil have chief authority in the ministration of**

¹ The doctrine of "Intention" is noticed in connection with the question of the validity of Anglican Orders in the Commentary on Article XXXVI. See below, p. 755.

the word and sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receiving of the sacraments.

At the same time, important as it is that this principle should be established, it is no less necessary that the Church should guard herself with the utmost care from any suspicion of indifference to the character of the lives of her ministers, whom she charges before their ordination to the priesthood to "endeavour themselves to sanctify their lives, and to fashion them after the rule and doctrine of Christ, that they may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the people to follow"; and, therefore, it is well that the statement already considered should be followed by that in the last paragraph of the Article, which must commend itself to everyone, and seems to require no formal proof. **It appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.**

ARTICLE XXVII

De Baptismo.

Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod tanquam per instrumentum recte baptismum suscipientes, ecclesiæ inseruntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei, per Spiritum sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinæ invocationis, gratia augetur.

Baptismus parvulorum omnino in ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optime congruat.

Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened, but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

THIS Article dates from 1553; but in the revision of Elizabeth's reign, ten years later, the last paragraph was rewritten, and the language on Infant Baptism was considerably strengthened. The earlier clause had simply stated that "the custom of the Church to christen young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church."¹ The language of the Article

¹ It should be mentioned that though the words "per Spiritum Sanctum" stand in the *Latin* edition of 1553, there is nothing to correspond to them in the English. The omission was rectified in the English edition of Jugge and Cawood in 1563.

has not been traced to any earlier source. There is nothing in the Confession of Augsburg¹ or in the Thirteen Articles of 1538 suggesting its phraseology; nor is there any resemblance between its language and that of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* on the same subject.²

The object of the Article is to state the Church's teaching on Holy Baptism, in view of the errors of the Anabaptists, who (1) maintained an utterly unspiritual view of the sacrament, and (2) denied that Baptism ought to be administered to infants and young children.³

There are two main subjects which come before us for consideration—

- (1) The description of Baptism and its effects.
- (2) Infant Baptism.

I. *The Description of Baptism and its Effects.*

Each phrase in the description requires separate consideration.

(a) **Baptism is . . . a sign of profession.** So much was admitted by Zwingli and the Anabaptists, who regarded Baptism as little more than this. The expression used in the Article may be illustrated by the language of the closing exhortation in the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants in the Book of Common Prayer, where it is said that "Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which

¹ The Article in the Confession of Augsburg (IX.) is this: "De Baptismo docent, quod sit necessarius ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei; et quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum obliti Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum, et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri."

² *Ref. Legum Ecclesiast.*, *De Sacramentis*, cap. 3.

³ This, together with other errors on Baptism, is condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, *De Hæres.* cap. 18; and cf. Hermann's "Consultation," fol. cxlii.

is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him: that as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptized, die from sin and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."¹ This view of Baptism is based directly on the language of S. Paul in Rom. vi. 4, "We were buried with Him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (cf. also Col. ii. 12, "Having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, Who raised Him from the dead").

(b) It is a **mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened** (a non Christianis). Just as circumcision was a mark distinguishing the Jews from all others, so also Baptism distinguishes Christians from non-Christians. It is the initial rite by which a man is, so to speak, made a Christian. But Baptism is much more than this. It is to be regarded **not only** as a badge or mark, for,

¹ Cf. also the Collect for Easter Even (1662), "Grant, O Lord, that as we are baptized into the death of thy blessed Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, so by continually mortifying our corrupt affections we may be buried with him; and that through the grave and gate of death we may pass to our joyful resurrection; for His merits," etc. Expression is also given to the same thought in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiast.*, *De Sacramentis*, cap. 3: "Dum autem in aqua demergimur et rursus ex illa emergimus, Christi mors nobis primum et sepultura commendantur, deinde suscitatio quidem illius, et reditus ad vitam," etc. See also Bishop Lightfoot on Col. ii. 12: "Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. . . . Thus Baptism is an image of his participation both in the death and in the resurrection of Christ." It is obvious how much the *dramatic* impressiveness of Baptism and its representative force is increased where immersion is the method employed.

(c) It is **also a sign of regeneration or new birth.** Here it must be remembered that sacraments have been already defined in Article XXV. as "effectual signs of grace," and therefore, since "Regeneration" is the word which the Church has ever used to describe the grace of Baptism, and to sum up the blessings conveyed in it, we must interpret "sign" in this clause as an effectual sign; and thus the whole expression will mean that in Baptism the blessings of regeneration are not only represented, but are also conveyed to the recipient. The word Regeneration is expanded in the Church Catechism into "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," and explained in the following words: "For being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." It has been selected by the Church, not only because of its use by S. Paul, who speaks in Titus iii. 5 of a "laver of regeneration" (λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας),¹ in a connection in which it can only refer to Baptism, but also because, previously to this, expression had been given to the thought of a "new birth" as requisite by our Lord Himself in His conversation with Nicodemus, where, after saying, "Except a man be born anew (or *from above*, *ἄνωθεν*) he cannot see the kingdom of God,"² He explains His words by adding the statement that a man must be

¹ The only other passage in the New Testament in which the word παλιγγενεσία occurs is S. Matt. xix. 28, where it has no reference to Baptism.

² Thus among the Greek Fathers ἀναγέννησις occurs from the days of Justin Martyr onwards (*Apol.* I. lxi. : "Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται). (Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I. xiv. 1 : εἰς ἐξάρτησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως). Indeed it is more common in this connection than παλιγγενεσία. For these two words the Latins have but the one equivalent, *Regeneratio*, which is apparently first found of Christian Baptism in Tertullian, *De Resurr. Carnis*, xlvii. (its use in *De Carne Christi*, iv., is ambiguous).

“born of water and the Spirit” (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνευμάτων), S. John iii. 3, 5.¹

But though the word Regeneration sums up the special grace of Baptism, yet the precise blessings conveyed by it may seem to demand more explicit statement, and therefore the Article proceeds to define them, and to state them under at least three distinct heads.

1. By it (Latin *per quod*, i.e. by the *signum regenerationis*), **as by an instrument,² they that receive Baptism rightly** (recte) **are grafted into the Church.** So in the Church Catechism (dating in this part from 1549), the child is taught to speak of “my Baptism wherein I was made *a member of Christ*,” that is, a member of His mystical body, the Church; and the language of the Article is capable of abundant illustration from the Baptismal Offices in the Book of Common Prayer, which frequently speak of admission to the Church as one of the blessings of Baptism. Most pertinent are the words of the declaration of Regeneration to be used after the actual Baptism, which, as they date from the revision of 1552, are almost exactly contem-

¹ Since exception is sometimes taken to the reference of these words to Christian Baptism, it may be well to remind the reader of Hooker's forcible vindication of the Catholic interpretation of them, and the three arguments by which he supports it. (1) Where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst; (2) of all the ancients, there is not one that can be named that did ever understand it except of Baptism; and (3) “where the letter of the law hath two things plainly expressed, *water* as a duty on our part, *the Spirit* as a gift which God supplieth, there is danger in presuming so to interpret it as if the clause concerning ourselves were more than needeth. By such rare expositions we may perhaps in the end attain to be thought witty, but with ill advice.”—*Eccl. Pol.* Bk. V. c. lix.

² The phrase *tantum per instrumentum* was perhaps suggested by the Confession of Augsburg, which says (Article V.) that “*per verbum et sacramenta, tanquam per instrumenta, donatur Spiritus Sanctus.*” But the expression is not uncommon in contemporary writings. See Hardwick, p. 414.

porary with the Article before us. "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child *is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church,*" etc. The metaphor of "grafting" employed here and in the Article is suggested by the language of S. Paul in Rom. xi. 17 *seq.*; but throughout the Acts of the Apostles, Baptism everywhere appears as the rite of admission into the Church. Our Lord's charge after the resurrection had been, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, *baptizing them,*" etc. (S. Matt. xxviii. 19, cf. [S. Mark] xvi. 16), and from the day of Pentecost onward the command was obeyed, and those that received the word were forthwith "baptized." See Acts ii. 38, 41, viii. 12, ix. 18, x. 47, xvi. 15.

2. The promises of the forgiveness of sin . . . are visibly signed and sealed. So in the "Nicene" Creed the Christian is taught to say, "I acknowledge one Baptism *for the remission of sins,*" and Article IX. has already stated that "there is no condemnation to them that believe *and are baptized*" (*renatis et credentibus*). With regard to the expression employed in the Article, "signed and sealed" (*obsignantur*), its force will be clearly seen when it is remembered that "a seal is appended to a deed of gift or any other grant, when the donor, who has promised it, *actually makes the thing promised over to the receiver,* and thereby assures the possession of it to him."¹ Thus the words of the Article imply that Baptism is the moment in the spiritual life in which the forgiveness of sin is actually made over to us. It is not to be inferred that Divine grace has been altogether withheld from the Catechumen. In the case of adults it must have been present, or they would never have come forward "truly repenting, and coming to Christ by faith." But

¹ Sadler's *Church Doctrine Bible Truth*, p. 120.

what is meant is that Baptism is the decisive moment in which a person passes out of the order of nature into that of grace, and in which, according to the teaching of Scripture and the Church, the forgiveness of his sins is "visibly signed and sealed." Very instructive is the language of Scripture on the case of S. Paul. There can be no question that he received Divine grace at the moment of his conversion. For three days after this he was left to himself, and grace was working in his heart: "For behold he prayeth," was the description of him given to Ananias (Acts ix. 11). But not till the time of his Baptism were his sins washed away, for the words of Ananias to him were these: "And now, why tarriest thou? arise, and *be baptized, and wash away thy sins*, calling on His name" (Acts xxii. 16). So on the day of Pentecost those who heard Peter speak received the grace of compunction, for "they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do?" but the forgiveness of their sin is connected by the Apostle with the decisive act of Baptism: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 37, 38).¹ With these passages before us there can be no doubt that the Church is right in thus connecting, as she has ever done, the promise of forgiveness of sin with the sacrament of Baptism.²

¹ Cf. Eph. v. 25, 26: "Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word (*καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι*); that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish."

² The teaching of the Church may be illustrated from the Baptismal Offices, wherein we are taught to "call upon God for this infant, that he, coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive remission of his sins by

It may be added that even John the Baptist “preached the baptism of repentance *unto remission of sins*” (S. Mark i. 4), and that the natural action of water in cleansing would almost of necessity suggest that something analogous to this in the spiritual sphere was intended to be effected by Baptism, more especially as the symbolism had been so fully recognised under the Old Covenant, *e.g.* in the symbolic washings of the priests under the law (Lev. viii. 6); the cleansing of the leper (Lev. xiv. 8); the Psalmist’s prayer, “Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin” (Ps. li. 2); and many passages in the Prophets, such as Is. i. 16; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Zech. xiii. 1, and others.

3. The promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God . . . are visibly signed and sealed. So in the Catechism we have the expression “my baptism wherein I was made . . . a child of God”—a child, that is, by adoption and grace, for we are all children of God by creation, and Christ alone is God’s “Son” by nature and eternal generation; and so (to illustrate the language of the Article once more from the Book of Common Prayer) after a child has been baptized we are taught to thank God “that it hath pleased [Him] to regenerate this infant with [His] Holy Spirit, *to receive him for [His] own child by adoption*, and to incorporate

spiritual regeneration,” and pray that God would “sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sins.” Naturally there is even more emphasis laid on this in the form for the Baptism of such as are of riper years, in whose case there is actual as well as original sin to be washed away. See especially the exhortation after the Gospel: “Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe that He will favourably receive these present persons, truly repenting and coming unto Him by faith; *that He will grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost*; that He will give them the blessing,” etc. The words in italics are substituted for “that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy” in the corresponding passage in the Office for the Baptism of Infants.

him into [His] holy Church.¹ Again, the language used in the Article is entirely Scriptural. S. Paul tells us that "when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them which were under the law, *that we might receive the adoption of sons*" (τὴν υἰοθεσίαν), Gal. iv. 4, 5; and in Rom. viii. 15-17 he says, "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption (πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας), whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him." It is true that there is no direct mention of the rite of Baptism in this passage; but the tense used (ἐλάβετε, Aorist) points to a *definite time*, and that can only be the time of Baptism,² with which the thought of sonship is connected by S. Paul in Gal. iii. 26, 27: "Ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. *For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.*"

We now come to the consideration of the words **by the Holy Ghost** (per Spiritum Sanctum), which stand in the Article in the middle of the sentence now under consideration. As usually taken, they are connected with the words which immediately precede them, so that the Article is made to speak of "the promises of . . . our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost" being "visibly signed and sealed." It seems, however, unquestionable that they were originally in-

¹ Compare the recognition of the same truth in the *Collect for Christmas Day*: "Almighty God . . . grant that we *being regenerate, and made thy children by adoption and grace*, may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit," etc.

² See Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary in loc.*

tended to be construed with the words that follow, and to refer to the action of the Holy Ghost in signing and sealing the promises. "The promises of the forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed." The words are thus punctuated in the authoritative Latin edition of 1563, and in the earliest English translations.¹ And though in English the natural order, if this were the meaning, would be "visibly signed and sealed by the Holy Ghost," yet against this must be set the fact that

¹ The evidence, so far as I have been able to collect it, is this—(1) In 1553 in the Latin MS. signed by the royal chaplains (*State Papers*, Edward VI. "Domestic," vol. xv. No. 28), as well as in the published Latin edition, there is no stop till after *obsignantur*, "*promissiones de . . . adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur*," etc. In the *English* the words "*per Spiritum Sanctum*" are not represented at all. (2) In 1563 in the Latin Parker MS. at Corpus College, Cambridge, there is no stop till after *obsignantur*, but in the *printed* edition, published by Wolfe, there is a comma after "*filios Dei*," "*adoptione nostra in filios Dei, per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur*." This is also the case in the *English* MSS. in the State Paper Office belonging to the same year (Elizabeth, "Domestic," vol. xxvii. Nos. 40 and 41), "*our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Spirit are visibly signed and sealed*"; as well as in the English edition published by Jugge and Cawood. The Latin MS. among the *State Papers* (*ubi supra*, No. 41a) has no stop till after *obsignantur*, but the arrangement of the words in the lines looks as if the words "*per Spiritum Sanctum*" were intended to be read with what follows rather than with what precedes. (3) In 1571 the *English* MS. signed by some of the Bishops, now in the Library of Corpus College, Cambridge, has the comma after "*sons of God*," "*our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed*." Of the published editions in this year the *Latin* (Daye) has no stop till after *obsignantur*; the English (Jugge and Cawood) punctuates as follows: "*our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed*." (4) The English reprint of 1628 with the Royal Declaration prefixed to it adopts the same punctuation as in the edition of 1571 by Jugge and Cawood. But (5) in a reprint of 1662 we find the modern punctuation. "*Our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed*." I cannot say whether it ever occurs earlier than this, but this is the earliest edition in which I have discovered it.

in the edition of 1571 there stands a comma *before* as well as *after* the words, thus: "the promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed," which does not look as if the translators intended them to be taken closely with the preceding words. Further, whatever may be the case elsewhere, in the instance before us the Latin is unquestionably the original, and in this there is nothing unnatural in the order of the words "*per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur.*" The words, then, should apparently be taken *as a definite recognition of the action of the Holy Spirit in Baptism.* By Him the promises are visibly signed and sealed. The "new birth," as our Lord Himself teaches us, is one of "water and the Spirit" (S. John iii. 5); and as S. Paul says, "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13).¹ It is clear, then, from the teaching of Holy Scripture that a new relation is formed between the baptized person and the Holy Spirit who is the instrument of his regeneration, and that in some sense the Holy Spirit is "given" in Baptism. As Hooker puts it with his usual accuracy, "Baptism was instituted that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life."² But it is a further question whether it is right to say precisely that the gift of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is given in Baptism apart from Confirmation. On the one

¹ Ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι denotes the means, and the εἰς (into one body) the result attained," Godet *in loc.*

² E. P. V. lx. 2.

hand, the gift of the Spirit is apparently definitely connected with Baptism (with no mention of Confirmation) in Acts ii. 38. On the other, though the action of the Holy Spirit might well be predicated, it is difficult to assert definitely the existence of the indwelling gift in the face of Acts viii. 15-17 and xix. 1-6, where the gift is distinctly connected with the "laying on of hands" which followed (in one case at least after some interval) after the actual Baptism. The question cannot be dealt with further here, as it is not directly raised by the terms of the Article. Indeed it appears to require a fuller consideration than it has yet received in the Church.¹

There remain some other words of the Article of which it is hard to say what is the precise significance, **faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God** (vi *divinæ invocationis*). No Scriptural authority can be urged, as in the case of the statements already made, for connecting these blessings with the administration of Baptism. Moreover, the Article contemplates the Baptism of infants, in whose case faith cannot be looked for; and yet the expression before us is "faith is *confirmed* and grace *increased*"—words which of necessity presuppose an already existent "faith" and "grace" which can be "confirmed" and "increased." The difficulty is a real one, and is not easily solved. But, on the whole, it appears to the present writer that the best solution is to understand the words as descriptive of that which takes place in the baptized, and subsequent to Baptism.² So

¹ Reference should be made to A. J. Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*.

² The following arrangement of the Article may serve to bring out the view taken of it in the text:—

Baptism is not only

(a) A sign of profession, and

in the Baptismal Office, the baptized persons present are taught to use these words, which correspond in a remarkable manner to the expression before us: "Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give Thee humble thanks, for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the knowledge of Thy *grace*, and *faith* in Thee. *Increase* this knowledge, and *confirm this faith* in us evermore." It is not claimed that this explanation of the words is altogether satisfactory; but it appears to be more free from difficulty than any other which has yet been suggested.¹

Since in some minds there appears to exist a certain amount of confusion on the subject of this Article, and a prejudice against the Church's doctrine of baptismal Regeneration, largely due, it is believed, to a misunderstanding of the term, it may be well if, before the subject of Infant Baptism be considered, a few words are added on the distinction between regeneration, conversion, and

(b) Mark of difference, etc., but is also

(c) A sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument,

(1) They that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church.

(2) The promises of the forgive-
ness of sin, and

(3) Of our adoption to be the
sons of God,

} by the Holy Ghost are visibly
signed and sealed.

Faith is confirmed; and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

¹ Cf. Britton, *Horæ Sacramentales*, p. 185: "The Church ends her description of the graces conferred by the sacrament with the word 'sealed'; and here speaks of the wholesome effect of her ritual upon the persons present." The clause is considered by Bishop Harold Browne in his work *On the Articles*, p. 667, where it is stated that "the Latin and English do not correspond, and appear to convey different ideas. The former would indicate that the invocation of God, which accompanies the act of Baptism, confirms faith and increases grace. The latter would imply that the prayers of the congregation might, over and above the ordinance of God, be blessed to the recipient's soul: so that, whereas he might receive grace by God's appointment, whether prayer accompanied Baptism or not, yet the addition of prayer was calculated to bring down more grace and to confirm faith."

renewal. *Regeneration*, as we have seen, is the Church's name for the special grace of Baptism, and in the Church's formularies is never used for anything else. What those blessings are has been already stated, and they need not be further described here. *Conversion* is in the Prayer Book spoken of but rarely: once the term is used of what we call the "conversion" of S. Paul;¹ once of a change of religion, the turning from heathenism to Christianity;² and once only in a more general sense of a turning from a life of sin to God.³ It is in this sense that it is popularly used now; and the word well expresses an experience which is needed by all save those who, like the Baptist, have been sanctified from their mother's womb. The difference between it and Regeneration may be expressed in this way. In Regeneration God gives Himself to the soul; in Conversion the soul gives itself to God. It may be illustrated from the Parable of the Prodigal Son. All the time that he was in the "far country" the prodigal was still a son. So the man who has once been regenerated in Baptism is still a "child of God," even though, like the prodigal, he has wandered away from the Father's house, and is spending his substance in riotous living. And that which in the parable is represented as the "coming to himself" of the prodigal, when he realised his condition and determined to arise and go to his father, and confess his sin, that in the spiritual reality is Conversion. Thus there is no sort of inconsistency in proclaiming both Regeneration and Conversion. It was just because the prodigal *was* a son that he could venture to arise and go

¹ The Collect for the Festival of the Conversion of S. Paul: "Grant that we, having his wonderful *conversion* in remembrance."

² Preface to the Book of Common Prayer: "The baptizing of natives in our plantations, and others *converted* to the faith."

³ The third Collect for Good Friday: "Nor wouldest the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be *converted* and live."

to his father, and say, *Father*. So also just because a person *is* a child of God in virtue of his Baptism, he can venture to arise and, confessing his sin, yet call God by the name of *Father*. *Renewal*, the third term mentioned above, should be distinguished from both Regeneration and Conversion, as that which, owing to man's natural infirmity, is constantly and even daily required in all Christians even after they are "converted." It is that for which we ask in the Collect for Christmas Day, in which we pray "that we, *being regenerate* and made [God's] children by adoption and grace, *may daily be renewed* by [His] Holy Spirit"; and again the prayer in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick," even after the sinner is absolved there is a prayer that God will "*renew* in him whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil, or by his own carnal will and frailness." If the language of the Book of Common Prayer in the various passages that have been here referred to be carefully attended to, it is believed that confusion will be avoided, and that the distinction between these several terms will be clearly apprehended.

II. *Infant Baptism.*

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

In considering the evidence for this assertion it may be well to begin with (a) the silence of Scripture. It is often said that there is no command to baptize infants, and therefore they are not proper subjects for the administration of the rite. In answer to this it may be pointed out that the charge to baptize is perfectly general. There is nothing in our Lord's words to *exclude* infants, and it is believed that had He intended them to

be excluded, He would have expressly said so. Indeed the silence of Scripture, so far from being an argument against the practice, may really be turned into one in its favour, for the Apostles and all Jews were perfectly familiar with the idea of children being brought into covenant with God by means of circumcision; and therefore when Christ instituted Baptism as the rite of admission to the new Covenant, and said nothing expressly as to the age of those to whom it was to be administered, the natural inference must have been that children were proper subjects of it, else the new Covenant would be narrower than the old. Nor was the analogy of circumcision the only thing that would incline the Apostles to the practice, if, as seems almost certain, Baptism was already practised by the Jews in the admission of proselytes. The Talmud lays down the express rule that infants were to be baptized with their parents;¹ and though its evidence does not positively prove that the custom was already in existence at the time of our Lord's earthly ministry, yet the probability is very strong that the Talmud is recording a tradition which dates back to so early a date. If, then, the Apostles were accustomed (1) to circumcision, and (2) in the case of proselytes to Infant Baptism, it can hardly be doubted that to them it would have seemed natural to include infants, and admit them into the new Covenant by means of the rite enjoined for "making disciples."

(b) But there is positive evidence to supplement the argument from silence. When S. John iii. 5 is connected with S. Mark x. 13-16, the inference that children are proper subjects for Baptism appears irresistible. "Except a man (τις) be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." These words teach the

¹ See the passages cited in Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ* on S. Matt. iii. 6 (vol. ii. p. 56).

“necessity” of Baptism for admission into the Church. But in S. Mark we are expressly told that the kingdom is “of such” as children; and, as the Baptismal Office in the Book of Common Prayer reminds us, our Lord “commanded the children to be brought unto Him, blamed those that would have kept them from Him, took them in His arms, and *blessed* them.” Nor is the fact (mentioned by S. Mark) that He thus “blessed them” without its importance in this connection. It teaches us that children are capable of receiving spiritual blessings, and thus furnishes an answer to a question sometimes asked—What good can Baptism do to them?

Thus we may say that **the Baptism of young children is . . . most agreeable with the institution of Christ, for**

(1) It was instituted as the rite of admission to His kingdom;

(2) He Himself has laid down no limit of age; but

(3) Asserts that children are to be allowed to come to Him, and

(4) Teaches that they are capable of receiving spiritual blessings.

(c) When we pass from the Gospels to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, it is not surprising that there is but little which bears directly upon the subject. Wherever and whenever the Church is in a *missionary* stage, the Baptism of adults must be the rule—that of young children the exception. It is so in the present day, and must of necessity have been so in the days of the Apostles. But there are hints and indications which appear sufficient to warrant the inference that the Apostles must have admitted young children to Baptism where the opportunity of so doing was given them.

We shall, perhaps, be wise not to lay too much stress on the mention of *whole households* being baptized (Acts

xvi. 15, 33 ; 1 Cor. i. 16), for it can never be proved that those particular households contained children (nor, however, on the other hand, is there the slightest evidence that they did *not*). But more to the point is it to notice that S. Peter in his address on the day of Pentecost seems expressly to point to the interest of children in the promise, and hence to their inclusion. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ . . . for to you is the promise, *and to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him" (Acts ii. 38, 39). And in full accordance with this, we notice that S. Paul in his Epistles sends messages to children, treating them as within the Covenant, and therefore, according to all the evidence available, as already baptized (see Eph. vi. 1 ; Col. iii. 20).

(d) It may be said that these indications are but slight. But there is nothing to be set against them on the other side. And the inference here drawn from them is confirmed by the fact that there is sufficient evidence from the Fathers to show that from the second century onwards the Church was familiar with the idea and practice of Infant Baptism, though, for the reason stated above, that she was still in her missionary stage, it must have been the exception rather than the rule. The Patristic evidence from the second and third centuries is here given. Beyond that period it is unnecessary to quote authorities for the practice.

Before the middle of the second century, the existence of the practice is implied in some words of Justin Martyr, who not only speaks of "many both men and women of sixty or seventy who had been Christ's disciples *from childhood*,"¹ but also compares Baptism with

¹ Πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἐξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἐβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσιν.—*Apol.* I. xv.

circumcision, and speaks of it as the "spiritual circumcision." This is especially noteworthy, as it occurs in his *Dialogue with Trypho*,¹ who was a Jew; and if the analogy failed in so important a point, it could hardly have been pressed as it is by Justin.

Towards the close of the century (A.D. 180) Irenæus has these words: "He came to save all by Himself—all, I say, who are regenerated by Him unto God, *infants, and little children*, and boys, and young men, and those of older age."²

No less decisive is the language of Tertullian (200), who in his book on Baptism argues strongly against the practice, urging that the rite should be postponed till the recipients of it are growing up. But the whole force of his words depends upon the fact that Baptism was actually being administered to young children when he wrote.³

In the writings of Origen (220) there is more than one passage which bears on the subject. Thus in his Commentary on the Romans he says definitely that it is an apostolic tradition "to administer Baptism *even to little children*," and gives the reason for this;⁴ and in the Homilies on S. Luke he speaks to the same effect, saying that infants are baptized for the remission of sins."⁵

¹ *Dial. cum Tryphone*, c. xliii.

² "Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per Eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores."—*Adv. Hær.* II. xxxiii. 2.

³ "Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipue tamen circa parvulos. . . . Veniant ergo dum adoleseunt," etc.—*De Baptismo*, xviii.

⁴ "Pro hoc et ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissæ sunt divinorum quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent."—*Com. in Ep. ad Rom.* Bk. V. c. ix.

⁵ "Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum pecca-

The last witness who need be cited is S. Cyprian (250). In his day we find that the analogy of circumcision was so rigidly pressed, that it was questioned whether it was lawful to administer Baptism before the eighth day after birth. The question is considered by him, and decided in the affirmative.¹ From this time onwards there can be no question as to the custom of the Church permitting Infant Baptism, although in many cases it was deliberately deferred owing to the dread of post-baptismal sin. This, however, has no real bearing on the question before us; and the passages quoted are sufficient to justify the statement made above, that from the second century onwards the Church was familiar with the idea and practice of Infant Baptism.

torum? vel quo tempore peccaverunt? aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus: Nullus mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram? Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli. Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu non potuerit intrare in regnum cœlorum."—*In Lucam Homilia XV.*; cf. *Hom. in Levit. viii.* § 3.

¹ *Ep.* lxiv. (ed. Hartel).

ARTICLE XXVIII

De Cœna Domini.

Cœna Domini non est tantum signum mutæ benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est sacramentum nostræ per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque ideo rite, digne et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus, est communicatio corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia, ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertii Scripturæ verbis adversatur, sacramenti naturam evertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in cœna, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in cœna, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

Of the Lord's Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

IN no Article are the changes introduced at the revision of 1563 of greater importance than in this. It is not

too much to say that they completely transform it and alter its character. In order to make this clear, it will be necessary to remind the reader briefly of the course of thought on the subject of the Eucharist in the Church of England during the sixteenth century.

In all the formularies put forth in the reign of Henry VIII. the doctrine of the real presence is strongly asserted,¹ as also in the abortive series of Articles agreed

¹ (1) The Ten Articles of 1536. "As touching the Sacrament of the Altar, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross for our redemption; and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received of all them which receive the said sacrament."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 11.

(2) "The Institution of a Christian man" (the "Bishops' Book") of 1537 repeats this almost word for word.—*Op. cit.* p. 100.

(3) The "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian man" (the King's Book) of 1543, not content with this, substitutes a passage which clearly teaches the doctrine of transubstantiation. "In the other sacraments the outward kind of the thing which is used in them remaineth still in their own nature and substance unchanged. But in this most high Sacrament of the Altar, the creatures which be taken to the use thereof as bread and wine, do not remain still in their own substance, but by the virtue of Christ's word in the consecration be changed and turned to the very substance of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ. So that although there appear the form of bread and wine, after the consecration, as did before, and to the outward senses nothing seemeth to be changed, yet must we, forsaking and renouncing the persuasion of our senses in this behalf, give our assent only to faith and to the plain word of Christ, which affirmeth that substance there offered, exhibited, and received, to be the very precious body and blood of our Lord. . . . By these words it is plain and evident to all them with meek, humble, and sincere heart will believe Christ's words, and be obedient unto faith, that in the sacrament, the things that be therein be the very body and blood of Christ in very substance."—*Op. cit.* p. 262.

upon by the Anglican and Lutheran divines in 1538.¹ But about the year 1545 Ridley came across the book of "Bertram," or rather Ratramn of Corbie (840), *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.² By this he was greatly impressed. "This Bertram," he said, "was the first that pulled me by the ear, and that brought me from the common error of the Romish Church, and caused me to search more diligently and exactly both the Scriptures and the writings of the old ecclesiastical Fathers in this matter."³ Nor did the influence of Ratramn's book end here; for Ridley, having been convinced by it himself, never rested till he had won over Cranmer also, and under his influence Cranmer was led definitely to abandon the medieval theory of transubstantiation.⁴ Even so, however, he wavered and hesitated as to what his *positive* belief was, and for a considerable time appears to have inclined to something like the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation;⁵ though finally, after the death of Bucer

¹ Art. VII. *De Eucharistia*: "De Eucharistia constanter credimus et docemus, quod in sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini, vere, substantialiter, et realiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi sub speciebus panis et vini. Et quod sub eisdem speciebus vere et realiter exhibentur et distribuuntur illis qui sacramentum accipiunt, sive bonis sive malis." This is decidedly stronger than the Article in the Confession of Augsburg, which in the original edition of 1530 runs as follows: "De cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuuntur vescentibus in cœna Domini, et improbant secus docentes." This was altered in the edition of 1540 to "De cœna Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in cœna Domini."—See *Sylloge Confessionum*, pp. 126 and 172.

² Ratramn's book was written in answer to questions addressed to him by Charles the Bald, in consequence of the work of Paschasius Radbert, in which a theory of transubstantiation had been plainly put forward. As against this, Ratramn strongly asserts that there is no change in the elements. See below, p. 650.

³ See Moule's *Bishop Ridley on the Lord's Supper*, p. 11.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 13.

⁵ In 1548 he issued an English translation of a Lutheran Catechism, and great was the dissatisfaction and disappointment among the more

early in 1551, he seems to have fallen completely under the influence of the Polish refugee John a Lasco, who sympathised entirely with the Swiss or Zwinglian school on the subject of the Eucharist. The result is seen in some of the changes introduced into the Book of Common Prayer in 1552, and in the publication of the Twentieth Article, *De cœna Domini*, in 1553. It will be remembered that in the Prayer Book of 1552, among other changes, the words of administration were altered,

ardent spirits at the position which he took up. "The Archbishop of Canterbury, moved, no doubt, by the advice of Peter Martyr and other Lutherans, has ordered a Catechism of some Lutheran opinions to be translated and published in our language. This little book has occasioned no little discord; so that fightings have frequently taken place among the common people, on account of their diversity of opinion, even during the sermons."—Burcher to Bullinger, Oct. 29, 1548 (*Original Letters*, p. 642). "This Thomas," wrote John ab Ulmis to the same correspondent (Aug. 18, 1548), "has fallen into so heavy a slumber that we entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter. For he has lately published a Catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the Papists in the Holy Supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well grounded, perspicuous, and lucid" (*ib.* p. 380). Towards the end of the year a change was noticed, for in November the same correspondent writes: "Even that Thomas himself about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, Master John a Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy" (p. 383). In 1549 he was apparently again inclined to higher views than were acceptable to the extreme men. Bucer had "very great influence with him"; he was with him "like another Scipio, and an inseparable companion" (pp. 64, 67). But by the end of the year he had taken a decided step. "The Archbishop of Canterbury," wrote Hooper to Bullinger on December 27, "entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself. He has some Articles of religion, to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, or else a licence for teaching is not granted them, and in these his sentiments respecting the Eucharist are pure and religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland" (p. 71). In the following year no room for doubt was left, as Cranmer's own *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament* was published.

"Take and eat (drink) this in remembrance," etc., being *substituted* for "the body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given (shed) for thee," etc., and that there appeared at the end of the Communion Office the "black rubric" or declaration concerning kneeling, which asserted that "thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here,—it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."¹ In the Article as published in the following year, 1553, the first, second, and fourth paragraphs were the same as those in our present one (save that the words "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament" were added in 1563). But the third paragraph was widely different from that which the Article now contains. It stood thus:

"Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some one certain place: therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as Holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

¹ On the history of this rubric, which was added at the last moment, see Dixon, iii. 475 *seq.*

Exactly in accord with this teaching is the language of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, which, it will be remembered, dates from the same period. In this a violent and rather coarse attack is made on both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, or "impanation," as it is called; and the "real presence" is positively denied.¹ On a review of these and other facts, there can be little doubt that in 1552 and 1553 the formularies of the Church in this country were (to say the least) intended to be acceptable to those who sympathised with the Swiss School of Reformers in regard to the Eucharist, and who held that the Presence was merely figurative. But happily the accession of Elizabeth, after the Marian reaction, brought with it a return to wiser counsels, and a great and marked change in the language of our formularies. In the Prayer Book (1559) the words of administration used in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. were restored, in addition to the formula of the second book, so that there might be once more a definite recognition of the Presence at the moment of administration to each individual; and the "black rubric" was altogether omitted.² In the Article, when it was republished a few years later (1563), the third paragraph, denying the "real and

¹ *Reformatio Legum Eccles.*, *De Hæres.* c. 19; cf. *De Sacramentis*, c. 4; "Cum autem ad hæc omnia nec transubstantiatione opus sit, nec illa quam fingere solebant reali præsentia corporis Christi, sed potius hæc curiosa hominum inventa primum contra naturam humanam sint a Filio Dei nostra causa sumptam, deinde cum Scripturis divinis pugnent, et præterea cum universa sacramentorum ratione confligant, ista tanquam frivola quædam somnia merito desecanda curavimus, et oblivione obruenda, præsertim cum magnum ex illis et perniciosum agmen superstitionum in ecclesia Dei importatum fuerit." This may well be contrasted with the much more sober condemnation of transubstantiation in the Articles.

² The rubric was restored in 1662 with the very important substitution of "corporal" for "real and essential."

bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood," was also deleted,¹ and in its place was inserted our present *third* paragraph, asserting in careful and accurate language that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." The author of this paragraph was Edmund Guest, Bishop of Rochester, who says in a letter to Cecil that is still preserved, that it was of "mine own penning," and that it was not intended to "exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof."²

Naturally these changes were not agreeable to the Puritan party in the Church,³ for they amounted to a complete change. Whereas in the latter years of Edward VI.'s reign the formularies had seemed to exclude the doctrine of the real Presence and to incline to Zwinglianism, they were now (at the lowest estimate) patient of a Catholic interpretation, and contained nothing under cover of which the Zwinglianizing party could honestly

¹ What makes the omission more noteworthy is that the following clause was presented to the Synod and rejected by it: "Christus in cœlum ascendens, corpori suo Immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit, humanæ enim naturæ veritatem (juxta Scripturas) perpetuo retinet, quam uno et definito loco esse, et non in multa, vel omnia simul loca diffundi oportet, quum igitur Christus in cœlum sublatus, ibi usque ad finem seculi sit permansurus, atque inde non aliunde (ut loquitur Augustinus) venturus sit, ad judicandum vivos et mortuos, non debet quisquam fidelium, carnis ejus et sanguinis, realem et corporalem (ut loquuntur) presentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri." See Lamb's *Historical Account of the XXXIX. Articles*, p. 12.

² The letter quoted in full in G. F. Hodge's *Bishop Guest Articles XXVIII. and XXIX.* p. 22.

³ See the letter of Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger, quoted in vol. i. p. 41, and the notice in Strype of the controversies concerning the Real Presence, and of Parker's supposed "Lutheranism," *Annals*, vol. i. p. 334; cf. Zurich Letters, p. 177.

shelter themselves. Moreover, they have since been supplemented by the clear teaching of the Church Catechism (1604). It follows from all this that the opinions of the Edwardian Reformers, such as Cranmer and Ridley, on the subject of the Holy Communion, have nothing more than an historical interest for us. Destructively they performed a task for which we owe them a great debt, in courageously attacking the medieval teaching on transubstantiation. But the positive character impressed upon the Articles in regard to Eucharistic doctrine is not theirs; nor have their writings any claim to be regarded even as an *expositio contemporanea* of formularies, which, in their present form, belong to a later date, and to a time when much greater respect was shown to the ancient teaching of the Church.

We are now in a position to consider the substance of the Article as it stood unchanged since 1563. It contains four paragraphs dealing with the following subjects:—

1. The description of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.
2. The doctrine of Transubstantiation.
3. The nature of the Presence, and the "mean whereby it is received."
4. Certain practices in connection with the Eucharist.

I. The Description of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

(a) **It is a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another.**

So much was admitted by the Anabaptists, who regarded it as an outward sign of our profession and fellowship, but nothing more. The Article admits that it is this, but it is **not only** this. Far more important is it to remember that it is **rather**

(b) **A Sacrament of our Redemption by**

Christ's death. It was instituted "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby," and by it we "proclaim the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26).

(c) **To such as rightly** (rite), **worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking** (communicatio) **of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.** This clause is entirely founded on S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. x. 16, the words of which it follows very closely: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion (*κοινωνία*, Vulg. communicatio) of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion with the Body of Christ?" This passage forms an inspired commentary upon the account of the institution, when (to follow S. Paul's own narrative of it) our Lord "took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is My body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of Me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." The value of the words of the Apostle cannot be over-estimated as interpreting the meaning of our Lord's words: "This is My body." They seem conclusive against transubstantiation on the one hand, and against a merely figurative presence on the other. The bread, he says, which we break,¹ is it not a *κοινωνία* with the body of Christ? *i.e.* that which coming between unites us with and makes us partakers of the body; for so we

¹ It is noteworthy that S. Paul's words are "the bread which we break," and "the cup of blessing which we bless," not simply "which we eat and drink." Thus he seems to lay the stress on the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup, *i.e.* on the consecration with which the Church has always connected the fact of the Presence.

may paraphrase the word. Thus the heavenly part of the Sacrament is conveyed to us through the earthly symbol consecrated by Christ's word of power; and the "inward part or thing signified" is, in the emphatic words of the Catechism (rightly emphatic, because the Presence had been explained away by some), "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Thus the Eucharist is, as Article XXV. maintains, an "effectual sign." It not only typifies, but also conveys; for all who "duly receive these holy mysteries" are fed "with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood" of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

So far the Article has spoken only of the fact of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood, teaching us that it is conveyed to us through "the bread which we break," and "the cup of blessing which we bless." But questions had been raised, and much controversy had taken place with regard to the manner and nature of the Presence; and these could not be altogether passed by without notice. To them, therefore, the next two paragraphs are devoted.

II. *Transubstantiation.*

In considering this it will be well to treat separately—

- (a) The history of the doctrine, and
- (b) The grounds on which it is condemned.

(a) *The history of the doctrine.*—During the first eight centuries there are singularly few traces of controversy on the subject of the Eucharist, and as a consequence the teaching of the Fathers concerning the Presence is informal and unsystematic. It is, however, quite clear from the language used by them, as well as

from the expressions employed in the Liturgies of the Church, (1) that they believed in the Real Presence, and yet (2) that they were not committed to any formal theory of the manner of it such as that which was afterwards elaborated, and (3) that they held the permanence and reality of the elements even after consecration. The ninth century made a change, as the doctrine then became a matter of controversy. The first, so far as we know, to write a formal treatise on the subject was Paschasius Radbert of Corbie, in 831. In his work, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, a carnal theory, involving practically the destruction and annihilation of the elements, was boldly taught. Again and again he asserts that after consecration there is "nihil aliud quam corpus et sanguis Domini."¹ The work of Paschasius was answered among others by Ratramn, whose treatise, denying the carnal presence, and maintaining a spiritual view, had such an influence on Ridley, and through him on Cranmer.² Others, however, as Hincmar (c. 850) and Haimo of Halberstadt (c. 850), wrote in favour of the teaching of Paschasius; Haimo, indeed, expressly teaching that "the invisible priest changes His visible creatures into the substance of His flesh and blood," and that "though the taste and figure of bread and wine remain, yet the nature of the substances is altogether changed into the body and blood of Christ."³ After this, however, the controversy died down, till the days of Lanfranc and Berengar, Archdeacon of Angers,

¹ See cc. ii. viii. xi. xii. xvi. xx., and cf. Gore's *Dissertations*, p. 236 seq. The work of Paschasius is given in Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. cxx.

² On the teaching of Ratramn, see Gore, *op. cit.* p. 240 seq.

³ Migne, *Patrol.* vol. cxviii. p. 817. It is generally stated that John Scotus Erigena joined in this controversy and wrote a work on the Eucharist. But this does not appear to have been the case, for the work ascribed to him by later writers has been shown by Canon Gore to be really the work of Ratramn. *Dissertations*, p. 240.

in the eleventh century. Berengar, who had attacked the popular doctrine with great vigour, was forced to recant at the Council of Rome under Nicholas II. (1059), and the form of recantation to which he was compelled to assent will show more clearly than anything else what was now the belief of the dominant party in the Church.

“Ego Berengarius indignus Sancti Mauricii Andegavensis ecclesiæ Diaconus cognoscens veram, Catholicam, et apostolicam fidem, anathematizo omnem hæresim, præcipue eam, de qua hactenus infamatus sum: quæ astruere conatur panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem solummodo sacramentum, et non verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, nec posse sensualiter, nisi in solo sacramento, manibus sacerdotum tractari, vel frangi, aut fidelium dentibus atteri. Consentio autem sanctæ Romanæ et apostolicæ sedi; et ore et corde profiteor de sacramento Dominicæ mensæ eandem fidem me tenere, quam dominus et venerabilis Papa Nicolaus et hæc sancta Synodus auctoritate evangelica et apostolica tenendam tradidit, mihiq; firmavit: scilicet panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri: jurans per sanctam et hominibus Trinitatem, per hæc sacrosancta Christi evangelia. Eos vero, qui contra hanc fidem venerint, cum dogmatibus et sectatoribus suis æterno anathemate dignos esse pronuntio. Quod si ego ipse aliquando contra hæc aliquid sentire aut prædicare præsumpsero, subjaceam canonum severitati. Lectio et perlecto sponte subscripsi.”¹

¹ Mansi, vol. xix. p. 900.

This asserts definitely that after consecration the bread and wine are the true Body and Blood of Christ in such a way that they are "sensibly," not only sacramentally, but really handled by the priest, broken, and ground by the teeth of the faithful. Practically this amounts to saying that the Body and Blood have *taken the place of* the elements; and it is very difficult to think that the expressions used can have been intended to be taken in any but a material sense of a sort of physical carnal presence.¹ But an obvious difficulty occurs here. If this is so, how is it that the appearances of bread and wine are there still? It was said that these were allowed to remain in order to test our faith, and to prevent the horror which would result were the Body and Blood to be openly manifested.² And further, advantage was taken by the schoolmen of the distinction drawn by the philosophy of the day between "substance" and "accidents." It was taught that the "accidents" remain, and that therefore taste, appearance, smell, etc. are unchanged, but that the "substance" of bread and wine had been annihilated and replaced by the "substance" of the Body and Blood, *i.e.* that the bread and wine had been *transubstantiated* into the Body and the Blood. The actual word by which this theory is commonly known, "transubstantiatio," appears to have been first used during the eleventh century,³ and was definitely adopted by Innocent III. at the Fourth Lateran Council in

¹ See the summary of the conclusions of Witmund, *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate*, in Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 259.

² So Paschasius, x. xi.

³ It has been generally stated that the first known occurrence of the word is in the work of Stephen, bishop of Autun, *De Sacramento Altaris* (c. 1100). It appears, however, before this in the Exposition of the Canon of the Mass, by Peter Damien (who died in 1072), first published by Cardinal Mai, *Script. vet. nova Collectio*, vol. vi. p. 211 *seq.*; see c. vii.

1215, when a decree was promulgated, laying down that the Body and Blood are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the forms of bread and wine, the bread being *transubstantiated* into the Body, and the wine into the Blood, by Divine power.¹

From this time onward the word was commonly employed in the Western Church.² But it is no more free from ambiguity than is the word "substance" itself. This, taken in its philosophical sense, is nothing that is tangible, or that the senses are cognizant of; these can only come in contact with the "accidents" or qualities. The "substance" is the underlying *something* which constitutes the thing, which makes it what it is, in which the "accidents" cohere. But, taken in its ordinary popular sense, "substance" suggests to plain, untrained, and unphilosophical minds something material and tangible, something which they can see, and with which the senses can come in contact. Hence it will be seen that even after it had been laid down that the elements were "transubstantiated" into the Body and Blood, there was still room for wide difference of opinion as to the nature of the change involved. By instructed Theologians it was understood of a change

¹ "In qua [ecclesia] idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina."—Labbe and Cossart, vol. vii. p. 18.

² The Eastern Church accepts the corresponding term *μετουσίωσις*. It is doubtful, however, whether any instance of its use occurs earlier than the sixteenth century. The older words used for the change effected by consecration were *μεταστοιχείωσις*, *μεταβολή*, *μετάθεσις*, and *μεταλλαγή*; and Archbishop Platon of Moscow lays down that the word *μετουσίωσις* is to be taken in the sense in which the Fathers used these other terms, and is not to be understood of a physical and carnal transubstantiation, but of one that is sacramental and mystical. See Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, vol. i. p. 172; but see the *Confession of Dositheus* (Kimmel, p. 457 seq.), and cf. Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 282.

that was spiritual and entirely free from any gross or carnal sense. But to those to whose minds the ordinary associations of the word "substance" clung, it could only suggest a material physical presence. The great schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from Peter Lombard onwards, had done something to free the doctrine from the terribly materialistic ideas in which it had originated,¹ but after their days a period of decadence set in; the clergy of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were for the most part not well-instructed Theologians; and there can be no doubt that the doctrine commonly accepted at the beginning of the sixteenth century was a grossly carnal and material one. There is abundant and painful evidence of this, not only in the language of those who (often coarsely and in ill-considered language) assailed the popular theory, but also in the language of its defenders. Thus one of the forms of recantation submitted to Sir John Cheke under the direction of Cardinal Pole reasserts in plain terms the view contained in the recantation of Berengarius, cited above.²

¹ See, *e.g.*, the language of Peter Lombard, *Libri Sentent.* IV. *dist.* xi. xii. xiii.

² See Strype's *Life of Sir John Cheke*, p. 123: "'I, Sir John Cheke, Knight,' etc. . . . The tenor of which was, that he pretended with heart and mouth to profess that he acknowledged the true Catholic and Apostolical faith, and did execrate all heresy, and namely that wherewith he lately had been infamed, as holding that the bread and wine upon the altar, after the consecration of the priest, remained only a sacrament, and were not the very Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, neither could be handled or broken by the priest's hands, or chewed with the teeth of the faithful, otherwise than only in manner of a sacrament. That he consented now to the holy and apostolical Church of Rome, and professed with mouth and heart to hold the same faith touching the sacrament of the Lord's Mass, which Pope Nicholas with his Synod at Rome, anno 1058, did hold, and commanded to be held by his evangelical and apostolical authority; that is, that the bread and wine upon the altar, after consecration, are not only a sacrament, but also are

In spite, however, of the popular superstitions encouraged by the use of the term, it was authoritatively reasserted at the Council of Trent. The whole question of the Eucharist was there considered at the thirteenth session in October 1551, more than a year before the promulgation of the English Articles of 1553. At this session it was laid down—(1) that “in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the form of those sensible things”;¹ and (2) that “because Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the form of bread to be verily His own Body, therefore it has ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine, a conversion takes place of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood: which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, conveniently and properly called Transubstantiation.”² Further, the

the very true and self-same Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, felt and broken with hands, and chewed with teeth: swearing by the holy Evangelists that whosoever should hold or say to the contrary, he should hold them perpetually accursed; and that if he himself should hereafter presume to teach against the same, he should be content to abide the severity and rigour of the Canons,” etc.

¹ “Principio docet sancta Synodus et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur in almo sanctæ Eucharistiæ sacramento, post panis et vini consecrationem, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum verum Deum atque hominem, vere, realiter, ac substantialiter sub specie illarum rerum sensibilibus contineri.”—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xiii. cap. 1.

² “Quoniam autem Christus redemptor noster, corpus suum id quod sub specie panis offerebat, vere esse dixit; ideo persuasum semper in ecclesia Dei fuit, idque nunc denuo sancta hæc Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam Corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini

first two Canons passed at this session were the following:—

“If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are verily, really, and substantially contained the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently whole Christ; but shall say that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure or virtue: let him be anathema.

“If any one shall say that in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, the form only of the bread and wine remaining, which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation: let him be anathema.”¹

Thus the scholastic theory was formally sanctioned by the Roman Church, and is regarded as an Article of faith in that communion to this day.

(b) *The grounds on which the doctrine is condemned.*

The Article gives *four* grounds for rejecting the

in substantiam Sanguinis Ejus; quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata.”—*Ib.* cap. 4.

¹ “Si quis negaverit in sanctissimo Eucharistiæ Sacramento contineri vere realiter et substantialiter Corpus et Sanguinem, una cum anima et Divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum: sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in signo, vel figura, aut virtute, anathema sit.

“Si quis dixerit in sacrosancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini, una cum Corpore et Sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi; negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in Corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in Sanguinem, manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini, quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissime Transubstantiationem appellat: anathema sit.”—*Ib.* Canons 1 and 2.

doctrine. It says that **Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord—**

(1) **Cannot be proved by Holy Writ.** It is hard to see how a philosophical theory such as Transubstantiation confessedly is, can ever be “proved by Holy Writ.” Romanists point to the words of institution, *Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου*. But though they can certainly be claimed in favour of the real Presence, yet to bring into them a theory of “accidents” remaining while the “substance” is changed, is to read into the text that which is certainly not contained in it, and what we deny can reasonably be inferred from it.¹

(2) **It is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.** According to the theory now under consideration, what remains after consecration is no longer “bread,” and has no claim to be so called. But Scripture freely speaks of that which is received as “bread,” *e.g.* “As often as ye eat *this bread* and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord’s death till He come. . . . Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of *the bread* and drink of the cup” (1 Cor. xi. 26, 28).

(3) **It overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.** It is of the essence of a sacrament that there should be in it two parts—the “outward visible sign” and the “inward spiritual grace.” But if “bread,” the outward visible sign in the Eucharist, no longer remains after consecration, one of the two essential parts has been destroyed, and the “nature of a sacrament” is “overthrown.”

¹ Both Scotus and Bellarmine have allowed that there is no passage of Scripture so plain as to compel belief in Transubstantiation, apart from the decree of the Lateran Council. See Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia*, III. xxiii., where Scotus is referred to [*In IV. dist. xi. q. 3*]. Cf. Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, vol. ii. p. 446.

(4) It **hath given occasion to many superstitions.** These words are only too painfully true, and in support of them reference may be made to the medieval stories of alleged miracles, such as those freely instanced by Paschasius Radbert,¹ in which the Host has disappeared, and the Infant Christ Himself been seen, or where drops of blood have been seen to flow from the consecrated wafer. Of these none is more to the point than the so-called miracle of Bolsena, which led to the institution of the Festival of Corpus Christi in 1264. According to one account, the miracle, in which the corporal was suddenly covered with red spots in the shape of a Host, actually happened to remove the priest's doubts concerning Transubstantiation.

These four arguments brought forward in the Article appear to be perfectly satisfactory, as directed against the coarse and carnal form of the doctrine which was present to the minds of those who compiled the Article. But it must be admitted that they scarcely touch the subtle and more refined and spiritual form in which it is held by thoughtful and well-instructed Romanists. With regard to the *first two* arguments, they may fairly point to the fact that the consecrated Host is actually termed "panis" in the Missal, and therefore may claim that they recognise it as in some sense "bread," and give it the same term as does S. Paul.² As to the *third*, they reply that "what we see, feel, or taste in the Blessed Sacrament is real, for the accidents are real entities, and the accidents are all that the senses ever do perceive. . . . It is, moreover, because the accidents remain that the Eucharist is a sacrament. They constitute the outward part—they are the sensible sign of

¹ A considerable number of such "miracles" are related in his work, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. xiv.

² Cf. Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia*, I. c. xi.

that refreshment of the soul which follows from a worthy reception of the Blessed Sacrament.”¹ The *fourth* argument is obviously inconclusive as an argument. If everything that “hath given occasion to many superstitions” is to be rejected, then Christianity itself must go, for there is scarcely a doctrine which has not been so perverted and abused. But even with regard to the more refined and spiritual form in which the doctrine is capable of being presented, we cannot but feel compelled to resist it when it is pressed as an Article of faith, and our assent to it is required as a condition of communion. At best it is but a theory of the schools, a philosophical opinion which is “destitute and incapable of proof,”² as well as “involved in tremendous metaphysical difficulties.”³ As such we decline to be bound by it. But as an “opinion,” hard as it is to free it altogether from materialistic conceptions,⁴ it has been conceded by Anglican divines, representing very different schools of thought, that it need be no bar to communion, provided no assent to it were demanded from us.⁵

¹ Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 347.

² Bp. Thirlwall, *Charge*, 1866, Appendix B.

³ Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 269.

⁴ Cf. Gore, *op. cit.* p. 271, where it is pointed out that the accepted teaching of the Roman Church holds that the real Presence is withdrawn as soon as the process of digestion commences; and the following is quoted from Perrone, *Prælectiones Theologicæ*: “Etenim cum species eo devenerint ut corpus sive materia dissolvi seu corrumpi deberet, cessante reali corporis Christi præsentia, Deus omnipotentia sua iterum producit materialem panis aut vini substantiam in eo statu quo naturaliter inveniretur, si conversio nulla præcessisset, ut fides locum habent.”—*De Eucharistia*, § 151.

⁵ So Hooker, E. P. V. lxvii. 6: “‘This is My body,’ and ‘This is My blood,’ being words of promise, sith we all agree that by the sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform His promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation the sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ or no?—a thing which no way can either further or hinder us however it stand, because our participation of Christ in this sacra-

III. *The Nature of the Presence and the "Mean whereby it is received."*

On the nature of the Presence the teaching of the Article is this. The Body and Blood are in no way carnally and corporeally present, *i.e.* after the manner of a body, physically, and according to the laws which govern a local and material presence, for **the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner**; that is, it is present in a manner above sense and nature, by the power and working of God's Holy Spirit, and for the highest spiritual ends. It has been noticed by a thoughtful writer that in this clause "the body of Christ is not said in a general way to be 'received,' but to be 'given, taken, and eaten'; as if there were a solicitude, in correcting the abuses of the sacrament, explicitly to maintain the union between the heavenly and spiritual blessing

ment dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipotent power which maketh it His body and blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the elements such as they imagine, we need not greatly to care nor inquire." Cf. the MS. note in which Hooker defends these words, quoted by Mr. Keble (*Hooker's Works*, vol. ii. p. 353). Bp. Andrewes: "*De Hoc est*, fide firma tenemus, quod sit: *De, Hoc modo est* (nempe, Transubstantiato in corpus pane), de modo quo fiat ut sit, per, sive (*In*, sive *Con*, sive *Sub*, sive *Trans*) nullum inibi verbum est. Et quia verbum nullum, merito a fide ablegamus procul: inter *Scita Scholæ* fortasse, inter *Fides Articulos* non ponimus."—*Resp. ad Bellarm.* p. 13 (A. C. Lib.). So Archbp. Bramhall places Transubstantiation "among the opinions of the schools, not among the Articles of our faith."—*Answer to Militiere*, p. 1. Burnet also says: "We think that neither consubstantiation nor transubstantiation, however ill-grounded we think them to be, ought to dissolve the union and communion of Churches."—*On Art. XXVIII.* And Bp. Harold Browne, in speaking of the teaching of Roman divines, admits that "by the more learned and liberal, statements have been made perpetually in acknowledgment of a spiritual rather than a carnal presence; and such as no enlightened Protestant would cavil at or refuse."—*Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles*, p. 701.

and the outward and visible sign. . . . To use these precise expressions, therefore, respecting the Body of Christ is, by clearest implication, to combine that 'heavenly and spiritual' blessing with the given and taken symbol."¹ The words of the whole paragraph imply that the Presence is what is now commonly called "objective," *i.e.* that it is *there*, in virtue of consecration, as something external to ourselves, in no way dependent on our feeling or perception of it. It is "given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." But **the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.** It is "given, taken, and eaten" (*datur, accipitur, et manducatur*). It is "received and eaten" (*accipitur et manducatur*). Three words are employed in the first sentence; only two in the second; and this designedly, for the Presence is not due to faith. Faith *receives*. It cannot *create* or *bestow*. The Presence must be there first, or it cannot be received. As Thorndike said, "the eating and drinking of it in the sacrament presupposes the being of it in the sacrament . . . unless a man can spiritually eat the Flesh and Blood of Christ in and by the sacrament, which is not *in* the sacrament *when* he eats and drinks it, but *by his* eating and drinking of it comes to be there."² If, however, it is clearly implied that the Presence is there first, before it is "received," it seems to be no less clearly taught in the last part of the clause that faith is a necessary condition to the reception of it, for "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." So much is practically confessed by Bishop Guest, the author of the clause, in a remarkable letter addressed to Cecil in 1571. Guest was very anxious

¹ A. Knox, *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 173.

² *Laws of the Church*, c. ii. § 12.

that Article XXIX. "Impii non manducant," which had been withdrawn before publication in 1563, should not now be restored, or receive any sanction "because it is quite contrary to the Scripture and the Fathers"; and in order to make the Twenty-eighth Article harmonise with the view that the wicked do partake of the body, though not fruitfully, he suggested that the word "only" should be removed, and that the word "profitably" should be inserted, and that the words should run, "the mean whereby the body of Christ is profitably received and eaten in the Supper is faith."¹ The Article was, however, left untouched, and the Twenty-ninth was, against his wish, inserted; and, if the words of the Articles are to be taken in their plain literal and grammatical sense, the whole paragraph would seem to indicate, (1) that the Presence is there independent of us, and thus that it is offered to all; but (2) that the faithful, and the faithful only, are able to receive it.

The subject will require some further consideration under the next Article, but so much it seemed necessary to say here, for the right understanding of the words before us.

All the positive statements of the Article with regard to the Presence in the Eucharist have now been discussed (for the fourth paragraph which still remains is concerned only with certain practices in connection with the sacrament), and if the exposition that has been given is a fair one, the result of it will be this: that while the doctrine of the real Presence is distinctly taught, and the theory of Transubstantiation is condemned, there is an entire absence of any counter theory of the manner of the Presence. And in this lies the real strength of the position taken up by the Church of England. She

¹ *State Papers*, "Domestic," Elizabeth, vol. lxxviii. No. 37. Cf. vol. i. p. 45.

devoutly accepts her Lord's words. She does not attempt to explain them away or to resolve them into a mere figure. But, on the other hand, she is content to hold them as a mystery. Her Lord has not explained them. He has nowhere revealed "how" His Body and Blood are present; and therefore she declines to speculate on the *manner*, and rejects as no part of the Church's faith all theories on the subject presented to her, whether that of Transubstantiation, or the Lutheran tenet of Consubstantiation, or that associated with the name of Calvin, the theory of a "virtual" presence only in the heart of the faithful recipient.¹

To the present writer it appears that on this mysterious subject we may well be content to make our own the words of Bishop Andrewes in the sixteenth century, and of Bishop Moberly in the nineteenth—

"Præsentiam credimus non minus quam vos veram: de modo præsentiae nihil temere definimus, addo, nec anxie inquirimus."²

"The Body and Blood of Christ are present, not corporeally (for that we know from our Lord's words

¹ This, it must be remembered, is a distinct "theory" quite as much as Transubstantiation. It is probably largely owing to the belief that it was the view of R. Hooker that it has obtained such wide acceptance in this country. It cannot, however, be fairly said that it represents the *whole* of Hooker's teaching on the subject. See Book V. c. lxxvii. § 1, where very strong language is used on "the power of the ministry of God," which "by blessing visible elements maketh them invisible grace" (a phrase which is scarcely reconcilable with a merely "receptionist" theory), and "hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and that blood which was poured out to redeem souls." The arguments in c. lxvii. by which Hooker seeks to justify his conclusion that "the real Presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament," cannot be deemed convincing, and the reader will find an able criticism of them in Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii. Introd. p. 202 *seq.*

² *Responsio ad Bellarm.* p. 13.

in John vi. 63), but spiritually, in and with the elements. We know no more . . . Consubstantiation, like Transubstantiation, is a *theory* of the *manner* of the Presence, whereas the Church only knows the Presence as a fact, respecting the manner and mode and extent of which she is not informed.”¹

IV. *Certain Practices in connection with the Eucharist.*

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. Of the practices here spoken of, at least three are directly enjoined by the Council of Trent, and it is possible that to the promulgation of the decrees of the thirteenth session of that Council (October 1551) the paragraph before us is due. The decrees in question lay down, (1) that “there is no room left for doubt that all the faithful of Christ, according to the custom ever received in the Catholic Church, exhibit in veneration the worship of *latria*, which is due to the true God, to this most holy sacrament”; (2) that “very piously and religiously was this custom introduced into the Church, that this most sublime and venerable sacrament should be, with special veneration and solemnity, celebrated every year on a certain day, and that a festival; and that it should be borne reverently and with honour in processions through the streets and public places”;² and (3) that

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 172 (ed. 1).

² “Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quia omnes Christi fideles pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. . . . Declarat præterea sancta Synodus pie et religiose admodum in Dei ecclesiam inductum fuisse hunc morem, ut singulis annis peculiari quodam et festo die præcelsum hoc et venerabile sacramentum singulari veneratione ac solemnitate celebraretur, utque in processionibus rever-

“the custom of reserving the Holy Eucharist in the ‘sacrarium’ is so ancient that even the age of the Council of Nicæa recognised it. Moreover, as to the carrying of the sacred Eucharist itself to the sick, and carefully reserving it to this purpose in churches, besides that it is conformable with the highest practice, equity, and reason, it is also found enjoined in numerous Councils, and observed according to the most ancient custom of the Catholic Church. Wherefore this holy Synod ordains that this salutary and necessary custom be by all means retained.”¹ These chapters are followed as usual by canons condemning with an anathema those who deny the lawfulness of these practices.

The statement made in the Article is worded with the utmost care, and with studied moderation. It cannot be said that any one of the practices is condemned or prohibited by it. It only amounts to this: that none of them can claim to be part of the original Divine institution. **The sacrament . . . was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.** That is all that is said; and in a formulary, such as the Articles, that was sufficient. The four practices in question, belonging mainly to the ritual use of the Church, came more directly into consideration in connection with the arrangements for public worship in the Book of Common Prayer.

enter et honorifice illud per vias et loca publica circumferretur.”—*Conc. Trid.* Sessio xiii. cap. 5.

¹ “Consuetudo asservandi in Sacratio sanctam Eucharistiam adeo antiqua est ut eam sæculum etiam Nicæni Concilii agnoverit. Porro deferri ipsam sacram Eucharistiam ad infirmos, et hunc usum diligenter in ecclesiis conservari, præterquam quod cum summa æquitate et ratione conjunctum est; tum multis in Conciliis præceptum invenitur et vetustissimo Catholicæ Ecclesiæ more est observatum. Quare sancta hæc Synodus retinendum omnino salutarem hunc et necessarium morem statuit.”—*Ib.* cap. vi.

1. Reservation for the sick, undoubtedly a primitive practice,¹ was permitted, under certain restrictions, in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.² In the Second Book (1552), in view of the danger of superstitious reservation,³ the provision for it was omitted altogether. At the last revision in 1662 an express direction was inserted in one of the rubrics at the end of the Order for Holy Communion, that "if any remain of [the bread and wine] which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."

2. The festival of Corpus Christi was removed from the Calendar in 1549, and the "carrying about" of the Eucharist in procession through the streets and public places is forbidden by the rubric that has just been quoted.

3. *The Elevation of the Host* for purposes of adoration is said to have been introduced about the year

¹ See Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. c. lxvii.: τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται.

² The sick were communicated with the reserved sacrament if there was a celebration of the Holy Communion on the same day; but if the day was "not appointed for the open Communion in the church," provision was made for a special consecration. See the rubrics before "the Communion of the Sick" in the book of 1549.

³ The danger of such superstitious reservation is very clearly indicated by the last rubric at the close of the Order of the Holy Communion in the Prayer Book of 1549: "Although it be read in ancient writers that the people many years passed received at the priest's hands the sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary: Yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness: lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the whole Realm, it is thought convenient the people commonly receive the sacrament of Christ's body, in their mouths, at the priest's hand."

1100,¹ and (like the institution of the festival of Corpus Christi) was a direct consequence of the growth of a belief in Transubstantiation. It was distinctly prohibited in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., though the prohibition is not repeated in the Second Book.²

4. *Adoration* of Christ present in the sacrament is not and cannot be prohibited. But it is one thing to worship Christ there present, and quite another to find in the sacrament a distinct localised object of worship; and the "Declaration concerning Kneeling," restored (with the important modification previously mentioned) in 1662, expressly says that by the posture of kneeling "no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."³

¹ See Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 546 *seq.* (ed. 1). And on the earlier elevation connected with the proclamation τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, which was certainly not for purposes of adoration, see the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 605.

² "These words before rehearsed [*i.e.* the words of consecration] are to be said, turning still to the altar, without any elevation, or showing the sacrament to the people."—Rubric after Consecration in the Prayer Book of 1549.

³ Reference may be made in general on this subject to Mozley's *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 210 *seq.*

ARTICLE XXIX

*De manducatione Corporis Christi,
et impios illud non manducare.*

Impii, et fide viva destituti, licet carnaliter et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) corporis et sanguinis Christi sacramentum dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantæ rei sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad iudicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

*Of the Wicked which do not eat the
Body of Christ in the Use of the
Lord's Supper.*

The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as S. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

THE first appearance of this Article (to which there is nothing corresponding in the series of 1553) is in Parker's MS., which was signed by the bishops on January 29, 1563.¹ It is also found in two English MSS. of almost the same date, now in the Record Office, in one of which there is a marginal note: "This is the original, but not passed."² In a *Latin* MS. in the same office it is altogether wanting,³ as it is in the published edition issued a few months later by Wolfe, the royal printer, under the direct authority of the Queen. It must, therefore, have been omitted either in the passage of the Articles through the Lower House of Convocation, or else at an even later stage by the direct interposition

¹ See vol. i. p. 30.

² *State Papers*, "Domestic," Elizabeth, vol. xxvii. Nos. 40 and 41.

³ *Ib.* No. 41A.

of the Queen herself, the reason for its omission evidently being a desire to avoid needlessly offending some of those who sympathised with medieval belief and feeling, whom it was desired, if possible, to retain within the limits of the Church. Since it lacked all authority it is naturally wanting in the printed copies up to 1571, when we meet with it again. On May 11th of that year the Articles were considered by the Upper House of Convocation, and a copy was subscribed by Parker and ten other bishops. In this the Twenty-ninth Article is contained.¹ A few days later we find Bishop Guest, by an appeal to Cecil, making a determined effort to prevent the ratification of it on the ground that it "will cause much business."² His efforts were, however, unavailing, as it is contained in the copy which was ratified by the Sovereign,³ and from this time forward it finds its place in all printed copies, both Latin and English. It will be remembered that by this date (1571) the Anglo-Roman schism was complete, and therefore there was not the same reason as there had been eight years earlier for withholding the Article.

The language of the Article has been traced to no earlier formulary; but it is throughout suggested by a

¹ A copy of this is given in Lamb's *Historical Account of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, No. iv.

² See above, p. 662, and G. F. Hodge's *Bishop Guest, Articles XXVIII. and XXIX.* p. 24.

³ Guest's letter in May 1571 had, however, apparently led to the interview between Cecil and Parker on June 4, referred to in Strype's *Parker*, pp. 331, 332, when Cecil questioned the reference to S. Augustine. The interview was followed by a letter from Parker on the same day, in which he told the Treasurer that he was "advisedly" still in the same opinion concerning the authority of S. Augustine, "and for further truth of the words, besides S. Austen, both he in other places and Prosper in his 'Sentences wrote of Austen' (Senten. 338 and 339), doth plainly affirm our opinion in the Article to be most true, howsoever some men vary from it." (Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 381.)

passage in the works of Augustine on S. John's Gospel. In the printed editions the text stands as follows: "Qui non manet in Christo et in quo non manet Christus procul dubio nec manducat [spiritualiter] carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem [licet carnaliter et visibiliter premit dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi]: sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit."¹ It is thought, however, that the text has been interpolated, and that the words placed in brackets are due, not to Augustine, but to Bede, in whose Commentary they are also found.

Coming now to the consideration of the substance of the Article, it may be noticed that the phrase employed in the title is not repeated in the Article itself. In the former, it is said of **the wicked** that they **do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper**. In the latter, the phrase used is that **in no wise are they partakers of Christ**. It has been thought that the heading is in itself inexact, and must be interpreted by the phrase in the Article itself, as many have held that though the wicked do actually receive the Body and Blood, and therefore in some sense "eat" it, yet since they receive it not to their soul's health, but to their condemnation, they are "in no wise partakers of Christ."² There can be no doubt that the medieval Church did thus teach that what the wicked receive in the Eucharist is the Body and Blood, Christ being present in the sacrament in their case to judge, as in the case of the faithful He is present to bless.³ But it may be doubted whether so

¹ *In Joann. Tract. xxvi. § 18.*

² See Pusey, *Real Presence*, p. 251 *seq.*

³ It is sufficient to refer to S. Thomas, *Summa*, iii. 80. 3: "Cum corpus Christi in sacramento semper permanet donec species sacramentales corrumpantur, etiam injustos homines Christi corpus manducare consequitur." For the Tridentine teaching, see Sess. xiii. cap. viii.

much would have been allowed in the early Church,¹ or whether it can be proved from Scripture. Two passages of the New Testament directly bear upon the question, (1) S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi. 27-29, and (2) S. John vi. 51-59. In the former passage the Apostle says: "Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the

¹ On the teaching of Augustine, see the interesting correspondence between Pusey and Keble, quoted in vol. iii. of Pusey's *Life*, Appendix to c. xviii.; but see also Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 232, where it is admitted that Augustine's language, while "probably somewhat inconsistent," "may fairly be interpreted on a receptionist theory like Hooker's." Even so late and so materialistic a writer as Paschasius Radbert is not really clear as to what the wicked receive. *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. vi., and cf. the following from Mozley, *Lectures*, etc. p. 203: "The language of the Fathers is not indeed free from some real and much more apparent disagreement on this subject. On a subject where language has so many nice distinctions to keep, it will not always keep them; nor avoid indiscriminateness, saying one thing when it means something else close and contiguous to it, but still quite different from it. Thus the rule or custom by which the bread itself was called the Body, as being the figure of the Body; and by which the whole sacrament, not distinguishing its material part from its spiritual, was called the Body, as containing the Body, necessarily led to occasional confusion of language; writers saying that the Body was always, and in any case, eaten together with the reception of the sacrament, without any condition, when they really meant that the bread, which was the sacrament of the Body, was eaten. Where, however, this distinction was in the writer's mind, a large mass of language shows that the true Body of Christ in the sacrament could not be eaten except by the medium of faith. S. Augustine, who is quoted in our Article on this point, has frequent similar statements. S. Hilary says, "The bread which cometh down from heaven is not received except by him who is a member of Christ" [*De Trinitate*, Lib. viii.]. S. Jerome says, "Those who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, neither eat His Body nor drink His Blood," [*in Esai.* lxvi. 17]; though he also speaks of the polluted and unworthy approaching the altar and drinking His Blood. But the connection which this latter assertion has with the visible altar and the open reception of the sacrament gives the body and blood here rather the open and sacramental sense just mentioned, than the true sense. "He who obeys not Christ," says Prosper, "neither eats His flesh nor drinks His blood" [*Sent.* 139]. "He receives who approveth himself," says Ambrose. "The wicked cannot eat the word made flesh," says Origen [*in Matt.* xv.].

blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body." These words beyond question teach us that the Body and Blood are so present that the unworthy communicant is guilty of their profanation. How could he fail to "discern" the Body, unless it was there? But it is by no means clear that S. Paul means to say that the unworthy communicant *receives* the Body. It is *there*, and he is so brought into contact with it as to be "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." But if it be true, as Article XXVIII. has asserted, that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith," then, although it is offered to him, he is incapable of receiving it, and thus **the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth . . . the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their own condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.** This view of the meaning of S. Paul's words derives support from our Lord's own statements in S. John vi. 51-59. There throughout He speaks of "life" as the gift imparted by "eating His Flesh" and "drinking His Blood." No doubt the discourse has a wider reference than only to the Holy Communion. Our Lord is speaking primarily of the Incarnation, and faith therein as the means of life. But from this He proceeds to speak of the way in which men can be united with Him and thus made sharers of His life, especially by "eating His Flesh" and "drinking His Blood." And when it is remembered that exactly a year after this discourse was spoken He took bread and

gave it to His disciples, and said, "Take, eat, this is my Body," and gave them to drink of the cup, saying, "This is my Blood," it seems impossible to doubt that the Holy Communion is intended to be in ordinary cases the means of that eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood of which He is speaking; and if this is so, since the wicked are certainly not made to "have life" through participation in the sacrament, it would not appear to be safe to assert that they do "eat the Body of Christ in the sacrament."

It cannot be maintained that it follows as a *necessary* inference from the doctrine of the real Presence; for if the connection of the Presence with the elements be of such a nature that of necessity *all* those who receive the outward elements *must* thereby also receive the "inward part," ulterior consequences will follow: such as the reception of the Body of Christ by birds or mice, which might through some deplorable accident eat a portion of the consecrated bread.¹ To this it may be added that "nowhere in Scripture do we hear of an eating and drinking of the true Body and Blood of our Lord which is not profitable. The Body and Blood are of that nature, that they are in the reason of the case, by the simple fact of being eaten and drunk, beneficial; and no such thing is contemplated as a *real* eating of them, which is not a *beneficial* eating of them also. "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood," saith the Lord, "hath eternal life. . . . He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him. . . . He that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me." The spiritual food of our Lord's Body and Blood cannot, as has been said, be eaten except spiritually; it cannot be

¹ For the extraordinary shifts to which the medievalists were driven in order to explain *what* really happens under such circumstances, see Witmund, *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate*, ii. § 7 seq.

eaten carnally by the mere natural mouth and teeth; such an idea is a discord and a contradiction in reason. But if it cannot be eaten except spiritually, how does the carnal man supply the spiritual medium and instrumentality of eating? The carnal man has only the natural mouth and teeth to apply; all this he has; but this is totally irrelevant to spiritual food."¹

On the whole, then, even if, as many have thought, the view that the wicked do actually receive the Body and Blood without being thereby made "partakers of Christ,"² be capable of reconciliation with the terms of this Article, yet it appears to be more in accordance with Holy Scripture and the mind of the primitive Church, as well as with the most obvious and natural meaning of Articles XXVIII. and XXIX.,³ to hold that the wicked, though brought (so to speak) in contact with the Body and Blood, are through want of faith unable to receive that spiritual food which is offered to them. Thus they are "in no wise partakers of Christ," because, lacking "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper," they "eat not the Body of Christ."⁴

¹ Mozley, *op. cit.* p. 205.

² This phrase which is used in the Article is taken from Heb. iii. 14.

³ It ought to be stated that Bishop Guest, in spite of his criticisms of this Article, felt himself able to sign it; for his signature is contained with those of other bishops in the MS. of May 11, 1571.

⁴ It should be added that it was freely admitted by both Cranmer and Ridley that *in some sense* the wicked may be said to "eat the Body." And their language is *verbally* identical with that of the Council of Trent, where it was said that "some receive it sacramentally only, viz. sinners, others sacramentally and spiritually" (Sess. xiii. cap. viii.). So Cranmer: "I say that the same visible and palpable flesh that was for us crucified . . . is eaten of Christian people at His holy Supper . . . the diversity is not in the body, but in the eating thereof; no man eating it carnally, but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, that is, figuratively."—*On the Lord's Supper* (Parker Society), p. 224. So Ridley: "Evil men do eat the very true

and natural body of Christ sacramentally and no further, as S. Augustine saith ; but good men do eat the very true body both sacramentally and spiritually by grace."—*Works* (Parker Society), p. 246. In these two extracts "sacramentally" is equivalent to "figuratively," or rather eating the body sacramentally is equivalent to "eating the sacrament of the body" (cf. the remarks on the language of the Fathers in the extract from Mozley on p. 671, note 1). This may throw some light on the wording of the "Prayer of Humble Access" in the Book of Common Prayer: "Grant us . . . so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, *that* our sinful bodies," etc.

ARTICLE XXX

De utraque specie.

Calix Domini Laicis non est denegandus: utraque enim pars dominici sacramenti ex Christi institutione et præcepto, omnibus Christianis ex æquo administrari debet.

Of both Kinds.

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people. For both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

THIS Article is one of the four which were added by Archbishop Parker in 1563. It was accepted by the Convocation, and has kept its place ever since without any change. In considering it, it will be well to treat separately—

1. The history of the practice condemned in it.
2. The arguments by which it has been justified.

I. The History of the Denial of the Cup to the Laity.

The evidence for the administration of **both the parts of the Lord's sacrament . . . to all Christian men alike**, whether clergy or laity, during the first eleven centuries, is so full and complete that it is not now even pretended by Roman divines that during this period the administration of the Eucharist in one kind was ever permitted in the Catholic Church, save only in exceptional cases, as (perhaps) to the sick.¹

¹ This admission was not always so readily made, for Bishop Watson in 1558 says that "the holy Church hath used, even from the time of Christ Himself and His Apostles, to minister this sacrament under the form of Bread only both to laymen and women, and also to priests, save

There is not one word in the New Testament to indicate that the Cup was to be withheld from the laity. On the contrary, S. Paul's language directly implies that he contemplated that all alike would receive both parts of the sacrament, for he says, "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, *and drink of the cup*" (1 Cor. xi. 28). The words of Justin Martyr are conclusive for the practice in the second century.¹ S. Cyril of Jerusalem² and many other Fathers supply evidence for the fourth and later centuries. But it is needless to cite testimonies when it is admitted by Cardinal Bona that "the faithful always and in all places, from the first beginnings of the Church till the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the species of bread and wine, and the use of the chalice began little by little to drop away in the beginning of that century, and many bishops forbade it to the people to avoid the risk of irreverence and spilling."³

There is, however, evidence which is very worthy of note, that during this period there was a tendency in some quarters to abstain from receiving the chalice, and that this was *severely condemned by the authorities of the Church*. Thus Leo I. (440) writes of certain Manichees, and says, "They receive Christ's Body with unworthy mouth, and entirely refuse to drink the Blood of our

when they do consecrate and minister to themselves with their own hands."—Serm. viii. p. xlvi (Lond. 1558); quoted in Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 621 (ed. 1). As Mr. Scudamore remarks: "A falsehood more gross and palpable could not be committed to writing."

¹ *Apol.* I. lxxv.: "The deacons give to each of those present to receive of the consecrated (εὐχαριστήεστος) bread and wine and water, and they carry them to those not present."

² *Cat. Myst.* v. 22: "Then after having partaken of the Body of Christ, approach also to the Cup of His Blood; not stretching forth thine hand, but bending and saying in the way of worship and reverence, Amen; be thou hallowed by partaking also of the Blood of Christ."

³ *Rerum Liturg.* Bk. II. c. xviii. § 1.

Redemption; therefore we give notice to you, holy brethren, that men of this sort, whose sacrilegious deceit has been detected, are to be expelled by priestly authority from the fellowship of the saints."¹

About fifty years later Gelasius I. (490) repeats the condemnation of the practice. "We have ascertained that certain persons, having received a portion of the sacred Body alone, abstain from partaking of the chalice of the sacred Blood. Let such persons, without any doubt (since they are stated to feel themselves bound by some superstitious reason), *either receive the sacrament in its entirety*, or be repelled from the entire sacrament, because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege."²

From these early testimonies we may pass on to the close of the eleventh century, when the custom was beginning to creep into the Catholic Church, probably from motives of reverence, and anxiety to avoid accidents or scandals. At this time the matter attracted some attention, and the custom of communicating in one kind alone was definitely condemned by the Council of Clermont under Urban II. (1095), as well as by Pascal II. at the beginning of the next century (1118). The twenty-eighth Canon of the Council is clear, and states positively that "no one shall communicate at the altar unless he receive the Body *and the Blood* separately and alike, unless by way of necessity and for caution";³

¹ *Hom.* xli.

² *Corpus Juris Canon. Decret.* III. ii. 12. The after-history of the decree is curious and instructing. Aquinas boldly says that "Gelasius speaks only in reference to priests, who, as they consecrate the whole sacrament, so ought they also to communicate in it whole."—*Summa*, III. q. lxxx. art. xii.

³ *Conc. Clarom.* Can. xxviii.: "Ne aliquis communicet de altari nisi corpus separatim et sanguinem similiter, nisi per necessitatem et cautelam."—Labbe and Cossart, vol. vi. p. 1719.

while the words of Pope Pascal are these: "Therefore, according to the same Cyprian, in receiving the Body and Blood of the Lord, let the Lord's tradition be observed; nor let any departure be made, through a human and novel institution, from what Christ the Master ordained and did. For we know that the bread was given separately and the wine given separately by the Lord Himself; which custom we therefore teach and command to be always observed in the holy Church, save in the case of infants and of very infirm people, who cannot swallow bread."¹

But that which was denounced by Pascal II. early in the eleventh century as a "human and novel institution," and a "departure" from Christ's ordinance, in the course of the next two centuries gradually spread throughout the West; and when the abuses of the Church began to attract general attention, and the cry for reformation of them made itself heard, there was none which was more severely denounced than this. It was one of the abuses for the reform of which much was hoped from the Council of Constance (1415). But instead of abolishing the practice of Communion in one kind, the Council not only ventured to assert that "though Christ instituted and gave this sacrament to His disciples under both kinds, yet the Church has the power of ordering that to the laity it be given under one kind only," but actually proceeded to exercise this "power" by positively forbidding Communion in both kinds to the lay people.² The troubles and bloodshed which were due to this decree are matters of history, on which it is

¹ *Ep.* 535.

² "Quod nullus presbyter sub pœna excommunicationis communicet populum sub utraque specie panis et vini."—*Conc. Const. Sessio xiii.* Labbe and Cossart, vol. viii. p. 581.

unnecessary to enter here.¹ The restoration of the Cup to the laity was insisted on in the Confession of Augsburg (1530) in the first of the Articles concerning abuses;² and though in this country nothing could be done in this direction so long as Henry VIII. was alive, yet after his death one of the earliest Acts was to provide an English form for communicating the people in both kinds (1548), and to put an end to the abuse of "half-communion," which had grown up. As far as the history of the practice is concerned, it is only needful to add that at the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent (October 1551) the doctrine of "concomitance" (on which the theological defence of the practice of communicating in one kind is based) was distinctly asserted, and that at the twenty-first session held in July 1562, shortly before the promulgation of our own Article, the practice was more definitely considered by the Council.

¹ See Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, vol. ii. p. 37 seq.

² "*De utraque specie.* Laicis datur utraque species sacramenti in cœna Domini, quia hic mos habet mandatum Domini, Matt. xxvi. *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, ubi manifeste præcepit Christus de poculo, ut omnes bibant, et ne quis possit cavillari, quod hoc ad sacerdotes tantum pertineat, Paulus ad Corinth. exemplum recitat, in quo apparet totam ecclesiam utraque specie usam esse. Et diu mansit hic mos in ecclesia, nec constat quando aut quo auctore mutatus sit, tametsi Cardinalis Cusanus recitet, quando sit approbatus. Cyprianus aliquot locis testatur populo sanguinem datum esse. Idem testatur Hieronymus, qui ait, sacerdotes eucharistiæ ministrant, et sanguinem Christi populis dividant. Imo Gelasius papa mandat ne dividatur sacramentum, Dist. II. de consecratione, cap. Comperimus. Tantum consuetudo non ita vetus aliud habet. Constat autem, quod consuetudo, contra mandata Dei introducta, non sit probanda, ut testantur canones, Dist. VIII. cap. Veritate, cum sequentibus. Hæc vero consuetudo non solum contra Scripturam, sed etiam contra veteres canones et exemplum ecclesiæ recepta est. Quare si qui maluerunt utraque specie sacramenti uti, non fuerunt cogendi, ut aliter facerent cum offensione conscientie.

"Et quia divisio sacramenti non convenit cum institutione Christi, solet apud nos omitti processio, quæ hactenus fieri solita est."—*Conf. August.* Pars II. art. i. *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 135.

It was determined to uphold the existing custom ; but it was an awkward one to defend, and the decrees of the Council concerning it are more remarkable for the boldness of their assertions than for any arguments offered in support of them. At the outset it is laid down dogmatically “ that laymen and clergy when not consecrating, are not obliged by any Divine precept to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds ; and that it cannot be by any means doubted, without injury to faith, that Communion in either kind is sufficient for them unto salvation ; for although Christ the Lord, in the last Supper, instituted and delivered to the Apostles this venerable sacrament in both kinds, of bread and wine, yet that institution and delivery do not therefore reach so far as that all the faithful of the Church be bound by the Lord’s institution to receive both kinds.”¹ It is added that no inference can rightly be drawn from S. John vi. 53 *seq.* that our Lord enjoined Communion in both kinds. It is next declared that in the dispensation of the sacraments, so long as their substance remains untouched, the Church has power to ordain or change whatever things might be deemed expedient, according to the variety of circumstances, times, and places ; and that, therefore, “ holy mother Church, knowing this her authority in the administration of the sacraments, although the use of both kinds has, from the beginning of the Christian religion, not been unfrequent, yet in

¹ “*Sancta ipsa Synodus . . . declarat ac docet, nullo divino præcepto laicos, et clericos, non conficientes, obligari ad Eucharistiæ sacramentum sub utraque specie sumendum ; neque ullo pacto, salva fide, dubitari posse quin illis alterius speciei Communio ad salutem sufficiat. Nam etsi Christus Dominus in ultima cæna venerabile hoc sacramentum in panis et vini speciebus instituit, et apostolis tradidit, non tamen illa institutio et traditio eo tendunt, ut omnes Christi fideles statuto Domini ad utramque speciem accipiendam astringantur.*”—*Conc. Trid. Sess. xxi. cap. i.*

process of time that custom having already been widely changed—has, induced by weighty and just reasons, approved of this custom of communicating under one kind, and decreed that it should be held as a law, which it is not lawful to reprobate or change at pleasure, without the authority of the Church itself.”¹ To this is added a reassertion of the doctrine of “Concomitance,”² as well as the following three canons on the subject:—

i. “If any one shall say that by the precept of God, or by necessity of salvation, all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both kinds of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist: let him be anathema.”

ii. “If any one shall say that the holy Catholic Church was not induced by just causes and reasons to communicate under the species of bread only, laymen and clergy when not consecrating; or has erred therein: let him be anathema.”

iii. “If any one shall deny that Christ, whole and entire, the fountain and author of all graces, is received under the one species of bread, because, as some falsely assert, He is not received according to the institution of Christ Himself under both kinds: let him be anathema.”³

¹ “Præterea declarat, hanc potestatem perpetuo in ecclesia fuisse, ut in sacramentorum dispensatione, salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret, quæ suscipientium utilitati, seu ipsorum sacramentorum venerationi pro rerum, temporum et locorum varietate, magis expedire judicaret . . . quare agnoscens Sancta Mater Ecclesia hanc suam in administratione sacramentorum auctoritatem, licet ab initio Christianæ Religionis non infrequens utriusque speciei usus fuisset; tamen progressu temporis latissime jam mutata illa consuetudine, gravibus et justis causis adducta, hanc consuetudinem sub altera specie communicandi approbavit, et pro lege habendam decrevit: quam reprobare, aut sine ipsius ecclesiæ auctoritate pro libito mutare non licet.”—Cap. ii.

² Cap. iii.

³ “Si quis dixerit, ex Dei præcepto, vel necessitate salutis, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi Eucharistiæ sacramenti sumere debere: anathema sit.

“Si quis dixerit, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam non justis causis et

But, finally, at the close of the canons a section is added, holding out a promise that on "the earliest opportunity that shall present itself," the Council will further consider whether some relaxation of her rules might be permitted, and the use of the chalice conceded in some nations or kingdoms under certain conditions.¹

It only remains to add that though exceptions have been made by special privilege, yet, as far as the great body of the faithful are concerned, this "opportunity" appears never to have come, and that the Roman Church remains to the present day bound by the Tridentine decrees upon the subject.

II. *The Arguments by which the Practice has been justified.*

These are of two kinds, (a) theological, and (b) practical.

(a) The theological ones are two in number, (1) the doctrine of concomitance, and (2) the Church's power to decree rites or ceremonies. The former of these, the doctrine of concomitance, is the belief which was definitely laid down at the thirteenth session of the Council of

rationibus adductam fuisse ut laicos, atque etiam Clericos non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse: anathema sit.

"Si quis negaverit, totum et integrum Christum omnium gratiarum fontem et auctorem, sub una panis specie sumi, quia, ut quidam falso asserunt, non secundum ipsius Christi constitutionem sub utraque specie sumatur: anathema sit."

¹ "Duos vero articulos, alias propositos, nondum tamen excussos, videlicet, an rationes, quibus sancta Catholica Ecclesia adducta fuit, ut communicaret laicos, atque etiam non celebrantes sacerdotes, sub una tantum panis specie, ita sint retinendæ, ut nulla ratione calicis usus cuiquam sit permittendus: et, an, si honestis et Christianæ charitati consentaneis rationibus concedendus alicui vel nationi vel regno calicis usus videatur, sub aliquibus conditionibus concedendus sit: et quænam sint illæ: eadem sancta Synodus in aliud tempus, oblata sibi quam primum occasione, examinandos, atque definiendos reservat."

Trent, that "as much is contained under either kind as under both, for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and likewise whole Christ is under the species of wine, and under its parts."¹ It must be said, however, that this doctrine, that "whole Christ," both body and blood, is received under either kind, is theologically most uncertain. There is no trace of any belief in it in the early Church. It only makes its appearance in connection with the growth of the doctrine of Transubstantiation,² and comes into prominence when a theological justification for the practice of Communion in one kind is wanted. There is but a single passage of Scripture which can with any show of reason be quoted in its favour: "Whosoever shall eat the bread *or* drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body *and* the blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 27). But it is rash in the extreme to infer the doctrine from this text, when the words of the institution are remembered, as well as S. Paul's comment upon them: "Jesus took bread . . . and said, Take, eat; this is My *body*. And He took a cup . . . and gave it to them saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is My *blood*" (S. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27). "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the *blood* of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the *body* of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16).

¹ "Verissimum est tantundem sub alterutra specie atque sub utraque contineri, totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie; et sub quavis ipsius speciei parte, totus item sub vini specie, et sub ejus partibus existit."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xiii. cap. iii. Cf. canon 3: "Si quis negaverit in venerabili sacramento Eucharistiæ sub una quaque specie, et sub singulis cujuscumque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri: anathema sit."

² Hildebert of Tours (1124) is "perhaps the first to affirm that the entire Christ is in either *species* taken by itself." Gore, *Dissert.* p. 266, where is quoted *De Cæna Domini*: "In acceptione sanguinis totum Christum, verum Deum et hominem, et in acceptione corporis similiter totum." Migne, vol. clxxi. p. 535.

Where the gifts are so carefully distinguished by our Lord and His Apostle, it seems the height of presumption to assert that "whole Christ" is so contained under either species that "they who receive one kind alone are not defrauded of any grace necessary to salvation."¹

Next, with regard to the Church's power to decree rites or ceremonies, we cannot admit that it extends to the alteration of a Divine command. Our Lord's words are express: "Drink ye *all* of it" (S. Matt. xxvi. 27). The limitations to the Church's legislative power have been already stated under Article XX. It was there shown that she may not "ordain anything contrary to God's word written"; and, with every desire to be charitable, it must be said that to order the celebrant alone to partake of the Eucharistic chalice *is* to ordain something that is directly contrary to Scripture.

(b) If the theological arguments thus fall to the ground, no weight whatever can be assigned to the practical ones. These are drawn mainly from convenience, the fear of accidents, and the desire, from motives of reverence, to do all that can be done to minimise the possibility of their occurring. As a matter of fact, we deny that the dangers are really serious. With due care

¹ "Insuper declarat, quamvis Redemptor noster ut antea dictum est in suprema illa cœna hoc sacramentum in duabus speciebus instituerit, et Apostolis tradiderit, tamen fatendum esse, etiam sub altera tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque sacramentum sumi; ac propterea, quod ad fructum attinet, nulla gratia, necessaria ad salutem, eos defraudari, qui unam speciem solam accipiunt."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxi. cap. iii. In connection with this the admission of Vasquez (quoted in Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 631) should be noted. "The opinion of those who say that greater fruit of grace is acquired from both species of this sacrament than from one only, has always appeared to me the more probable. . . . We grant that, according to this our opinion, the laity, to whom one species is denied, are defrauded of some grace indeed, yet not of any necessary to salvation; and that the Council did not mean to deny this."—*Com. in Thom. Aq.* P. III. q. lxxx. dist. cexv. c. ii. iii.

they can in almost every case be guarded against. But even if they were far more important than they are, we could not admit that they would justify the Church in departing from a plain direction of her Lord ; for, if Holy Scripture is to have any weight with us, it is most certain that **both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.**

ARTICLE XXXI

*De unica Christi oblatione in
Cruce perfecta.*

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosæ imposturæ.

*Of the one Oblation of Christ
finished upon the Cross.*

The offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priests¹ did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

THE alterations which have been made in this Article since it was first put forth in 1553 are insignificant and immaterial. In 1553 the English of the title was "of the *perfect* oblation of Christ *made* upon the Cross"; and in the last clause of the Article the "sacrifices of Masses" were said to be "*forged* fables," while "culpa" was translated "sin" instead of "guilt," and there was nothing in the Latin corresponding to the word "blasphema," which was only introduced in 1563.

The wording of the Article as a whole does not seem to be actually based on any earlier document; but some expressions in it may be traced to a draft Article prepared by Cranmer for the Conference of Anglicans and Lutherans in 1538, but not actually accepted by the

¹ In the majority of modern editions of the Articles this is incorrectly printed as "priest."

divines who then met together. This is headed "De missa privata," and in it occurs the following passage:—

"Damnanda est igitur impia illa opinio sentientium usum Sacramenti cultum esse a sacerdotibus applicandum *pro aliis, vivis et defunctis*, et mereri illis vitam æternam et *remissionem culpæ et pænæ* idque ex opere operato."¹

The expressions here placed in italics reappear, it will be noticed, almost word for word in our own Article. Besides this, as will be shown presently, the general thought, if not the actual words, of the Article may be abundantly illustrated by language that had been previously used.

The object of the Article is by a restatement of the doctrine of the perfection of Christ's atonement to condemn current theories of the Eucharistic sacrifice which seriously conflicted with it, and which led to grave practical abuses. The subjects treated of in it are thus two in number:

1. The sufficiency of the sacrifice of the Cross.
2. The condemnation of the "sacrifices of Masses."

I. *The Sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross.*

The offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. It is clear from the position of this Article in the series, as well as from the connection of the two clauses, the second of which is introduced by **wherefore**, that the doctrine of the Atonement is only here introduced in order to assert

¹ See Jenkyns' *Cranmer's Remains*, iv. p. 292; and cf. the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xlii. p. 39.

emphatically the ground on which the "sacrifices of Masses" are condemned. This first sentence, therefore, need not detain us long. Its language, which is very similar to that used in the opening of the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Holy Communion,¹ is in entire harmony with the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which special attention may be drawn to the following passages:—

vii. 26, 27: "For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for this He did once for all (ἐφάπαξ), when He offered up Himself."

ix. 11–14: "But Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation; nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?"

ix. 24–28: "Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often; as the

¹ "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own; else must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once (ἀπαξ) at the end of the ages hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment; so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him, unto salvation."

x. 10-14: "By which will we have been sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (ἐφάπαξ). And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: but He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever,¹ sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made the footstool of His feet. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

These passages are absolutely conclusive as to the perfection of the sacrifice once offered on Calvary. The language of the Article is entirely covered by them, and exception to this first clause in it could hardly be taken by any well-instructed Theologian. But if so much is admitted, an important consequence follows, for the words are entirely destructive of any notion that in the Eucharist there can be any sacrifice suppletory or additional to the sacrifice made "once for all" on the Cross. They prove, therefore, that (to borrow the words of a most careful Theologian) "the Eucharistic sacrifice, even in its highest aspect, must be put in one line (if we may so say), not with what Christ did once for all on the

¹ On the punctuation of these words, see Bp. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 314.

Cross, but with what He is continually doing in heaven ; that as present naturally in heaven and sacramentally in the Holy Eucharist, the Lamb of God exhibits Himself to the Father and pleads the Atonement as once finished in act, but ever living in operation ; that in neither case does He repeat it or add to it.”¹

But since the Article is not concerned with the statement of the true doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which has been called “commemorative, impetrative, applicative,”² the subject need not be further considered here. We may therefore pass at once to the second part of the Article.

II. *The Condemnation of “the Sacrifices of Masses.”*

The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said (vulgo dicebatur) that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits (blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosæ importunæ).

Public attention has been recently directed to this statement, and an altogether unreasonable amount of importance has been attached to it in connection with controversies on the validity of Anglican Orders. A desperate attempt has been made in some quarters to represent it as a denial of the Eucharistic sacrifice, whereas the terms in which it is drawn ought to have made it clear to every reader that this could never have been its object. Had it been the intention of its compilers broadly to deny this doctrine, nothing would have been easier than for them to use words which would have conveyed their meaning without any ambiguity.

¹ Bright's *Ancient Collects*, p. 144, note.

² Archbp. Bramhall, *Works* (Anglo-Catholic Library), vol. i. p. 54.

As a matter of fact, however, it is not even "the sacrifice of the Mass" which is condemned, but *the sacrifices of Masses* (missarum sacrificia), and in connection with them a current theory ("in which it was *commonly* said," quibus vulgo dicebatur) rather than a formal statement of doctrine.

What those who are responsible for the Article had before them was the whole system of private Masses, and the "opinion" which gave such disastrous encouragement to them (besides being the fruitful parent of other superstitions), that "Christ satisfied by His Passion for original sin, and instituted the Mass, in which might be made an oblation for daily sins, both mortal and venial."¹ Whether this dreadful perversion of the truth was ever authoritatively taught or seriously maintained by Theologians of repute is not the question, though it has been attributed to more than one.² The words just cited from the Confession of Augsburg are fair evidence that the error was sufficiently widely spread to demand notice;³ and it alone will account for the emphasis

¹ "Accessit opinio quæ auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit missam, in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus."—*Conf. August.* Pars II. art. iii. De missa. *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 139.

² *E.g.* a Spanish Theologian, Vasquez (1551-1604), attributes it to Catharinus, one of the Tridentine divines; and, as was pointed out in the first volume of this work, p. 149, the error is contained in a series of sermons attributed to Albertus Magnus. It has been replied that Catharinus has been misrepresented (see the *Tablet* for 1895, referred to in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xlii. p. 41); and it now appears that the sermons *De S. Eucharistiæ Sacramento* are not the work of Albertus Magnus (see the references as above, and Vacant, *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe*, p. 40). The *authorship*, however, of the sermons matters little. There they are; and nothing could be plainer than their language on the subject, as quoted in vol. i. p. 149. It conveys proof positive that the error *was* taught; and that is sufficient.

³ Cf. Gardiner's language, which can only have been called out by existing false teaching: "For when men add unto the Mass an opinion

which is laid twice over¹ in the Articles on the fact that the death of Christ is the perfect satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, *both original and actual*. The Tridentine decrees upholding private Masses, and laying down that the sacrifice of the Mass is "truly propitiatory (*vere propitiatorium*) both for the living and the dead,"² were certainly not present to the minds of

of satisfaction or of a new redemption, then do they put it to another use than it was ordained for."—Dixon, vol. iii. p. 264; and cf. Latimer's *Sermons*, pp. 72, 73 (Parker Soc.); and the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiast.*, *De Hæres.* c. 10: "Quapropter alia conquirunt sacrificia, quibus perpurgari possint, et ad hanc rem missas exhibent in quibus sacrificium Deo Patri credunt oblatum esse."

¹ Cf. Article II.

² *Conc. Trident.* Sess. xxii. cap. ii.: On these decrees see Mozley, *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 216: "The popular belief of later times exaggerated the Eucharistic sacrifice till it became, to all intents and purposes, a real one, and 'the priest offered up Christ on the altar for quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt'; that is to say, offered Him up as a Victim in a sense which could not be distinguished from that in which He was offered up by Himself on the Cross. It is true that the decree of the Council of Trent just saves itself by cautious, not to say dissembling language, from the extreme and monstrous conclusion that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same with that upon the Cross. It distinguishes between a bloody and an unbloody oblation; and it states that the fruits or consequences of the bloody oblation or the sacrifice on the Cross are 'received through the unbloody one' (*oblationis cruentæ fructus per hanc incruentam percipiuntur*); but at the same time it asserts that the sacrifice of the Mass is a really *propitiatory sacrifice—vere propitiatorium*. Now undoubtedly there are two senses in which an act may be said to be propitiatory. The act of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross had an original propitiatory power; that is to say, it was the cause of any other act, or any act of man, or any rite being propitiatory, that is, appeasing God's anger, and reconciling Him to the agent. We may allow that in common language a man may do something which will reconcile God to Him, and restore him to God's favour; but then all the power that any action of man can have for this end is a derived power, derived from Christ's sacrifice, from which any other sacrifice, the Eucharistic one included, borrows its virtue, and without which it would be wholly null and void. There is, then, an original propitiation and a borrowed propitiation, a first propitiation and a secondary one. Why then did the Fathers of Trent, when they had

those who formulated the Article, for they were not in existence, as the subject was only considered at Trent in the autumn of 1562, nearly ten years later. And it has been recently pointed out that these decrees are "the beginning, not the end, of a discussion which has been going on ever since," for "it is remarkable how little attempt there is in the Middle Ages to formulate the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, and how little theological interest is spent upon it."¹ It was the popular teaching alone which the Reformers had before them; and no one who knows anything of the history of the Reformation can doubt that the gravest abuses were connected with the whole system of private Masses, and that its "practical outcome . . . was to intensify the belief that Christ's once perfected oblation had to be reiterated and supplemented."² The system had fallen, swept away by the Acts for the suppression of Chantries passed in 1545 and 1547. It only remained to guard against any revival of the erroneous teaching on which it largely rested, and this was effectually done by the promulgation of the Article which has now been considered.

all human language at their command, deliberately choose to call the sacrifice of the Mass *vere propitiatorium*? They may have said that it was *vere propitiatorium* in the secondary sense; but no one can fail to see the misleading effect of such language, and that nothing could have been easier to the divines of Trent, had they chosen, than to draw a far more clear distinction than they did between the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice on the Cross. It is evident that, as ecclesiastical statesmen, they were afraid of interfering with the broad popular established view of the Mass, while, as theologians, they just contrived to secure themselves from the responsibility of a monstrous dogmatic statement."

¹ F. E. Brightman in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, Series i. pp. 193, 194.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xlii. p. 45. The whole discussion of this Article in the Review (pp. 38-49) is well worth consulting.

ARTICLE XXXII

De conjugio Sacerdotum.

Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconis, nullo mandato divino præceptum est, ut aut cœlibatum voveant, aut a matrimonio abstin-eant. Licet igitur etiam illis, ut ceteris omnibus Christianis, ubi hoc ad pietatem magis facere judi-caverint, pro suo arbitratu matri-monium contrahere.

Of the Marriage of Priests.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage. Therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

IN its present form this Article only dates from 1563, when it was entirely rewritten by Parker. The corresponding Article in the series of 1553, as originally drafted, ran as follows:—

“Cœlibatus ex verbo Dei præcipitur nemini.

“Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis non est man-datum ut cœlibatum voveant, neque jure divino coguntur matrimonio abstinere, *si donum non habeant, tametsi voverint, quandoquidem hoc voti genus verbo Dei repugnat.*”

It is found in this form in the MS. signed by the six royal chaplains; but before publication the last clause (placed above in italics), with its deliberate encouragement to priests to break the vows which they had taken, was omitted, so that the Article in English was simply this:

“*The State of Single Life is commanded to no Man by the Word of God.*”

“Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded to

vow the state of single life without marriage, neither by God's law are they compelled to abstain from matrimony."

The language of the Article has not been traced to any earlier source, though there is a very lengthy Article on the same subject headed like our own, "De conjugio Sacerdotum," in the Confession of Augsburg;¹ and the prohibition of matrimony to the clergy is condemned as a suggestion of the devil in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.²

There are two main statements in the Article, each of which requires separate treatment.

1. There is no prohibition of the marriage of the clergy in Scripture.

2. It is lawful for the clergy to marry if they think it advisable.

I. *There is no Prohibition of the Marriage of the Clergy in Scripture.*

Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.

This subject admits of the briefest treatment, for the statement made in the Article will scarcely be denied by the most ardent advocate of the rule of clerical celibacy; nor has the Roman Church ever committed herself to the assertion that it is more than an ecclesiastical law. There is certainly no single passage of Holy Scripture which can be cited as containing any command to the clergy either to "**vow the estate of single life,**" or to "**abstain from marriage.**" On the contrary, the injunctions of S. Paul distinctly contemplate the ordination of married men, and contain no hint that they are

¹ *Confessio Augustana*, Pars II. art. ii.

² *Ref. Legum Ecclesiast.*, De Hæres. c. 20.

expected to abstain from the use of marriage: "The bishop must be without reproach, *the husband of one wife*, temperate, sober-minded," etc. (1 Tim. iii. 2). "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest . . . appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee charge: if any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that believe," etc. (Titus i. 5, 6). "Let the deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well" (1 Tim. iii. 12). So elsewhere he claims for himself "the right"—although he was content to forego the exercise of it—"to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas" (1 Cor. ix. 5). These texts are conclusive. There is plainly nothing unscriptural in the existence of a married clergy; and we may pass on to the consideration of the next subject.

II. *It is lawful for the Clergy to marry if they think it advisable.*

It is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

For the existence in early days of a married clergy there is abundant evidence. But in considering it, two distinct questions present themselves which require separate treatment. (*a*) Was the use of marriage permitted to those clergy who had married before their ordination? and (*b*) was marriage *after* ordination permissible? The two questions must be examined separately; for it is not fair to quote, as is sometimes done, passages which imply the existence of a married clergy, as if they necessarily involved the fact that marriage was permitted to those who had previously entered into holy orders.

(a) There is no room whatever for doubting that during the first three centuries the use of marriage was freely allowed, and many allusions to the existence of a married clergy might be cited. *E.g.* Clement of Alexandria says that S. Paul certainly admits the husband of one wife, "whether he be presbyter, or deacon, or layman, using marriage blamelessly";¹ and the sixth of the "Apostolical Canons" forbid bishops, presbyters, and deacons to separate from their wives upon the pretext of piety, on pain of excommunication and deposition.² In the fourth century, for the first time, we find objection to this raised in the West, especially in Spain, which has throughout taken the lead in advocating strictness. Thus, at the Council of Elvira, at which Hosius was present (A.D. 306), the clergy were positively forbidden to live in wedlock with their wives.³ A canon enforcing the same prohibition was pressed (not improbably by Hosius himself) on the Council of Nicæa (325) for its acceptance as a rule of the universal Church. It was, however, rejected at the earnest entreaty of the Bishop Paphnutius, himself an unmarried man, and the stricter rule has never received the sanction of the whole Church.⁴ In spite of this, we trace a growing feeling in various quarters against the ministrations of a married clergy. The Council of Gangra (350) endeavoured to check it by condemning those who held aloof from the ministrations of such.⁵ But in the West the feeling made rapid progress, and before the close of the fourth century

¹ Ναὶ μὴν καὶ τὸν τῆς μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα πάνυ ἀποδέχεται καὶ πρεσβύτερος ἢ καὶ διάκονος καὶ λαϊκὸς ἀνεπιλήπτως γάμῳ χρώμενος.—*Stromateis*, III. xii. 90.

² *Apost. Can.* vi. : 'Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μὴ ἐκβαλλέτω προφάσει εὐλαβείας· ἐὰν δὲ ἐκβάλλῃ, ἀφοριζέσθω· ἐπιμένων δὲ, καθαιρείσθω.

³ *Conc. Illib. Can.* xxxiii.; cf. Dale, *Synod of Elvira*, p. 197.

⁴ Socrates, *H. E.* I. c. xi.; Sozomen, *H. E.* I. c. xxiii.

⁵ Canon iv. See Hefele, *Councils*, vol. ii. p. 329 (Eng. tr.).

began to obtain official sanction from the Church. A Council held at Carthage, under Genethlius, in 387 or 390, commands the bishops, priests, and deacons to separate from their wives;¹ and later Councils in Spain² and France³ insist upon the same rule. In the East, with partial exceptions, the stricter rule was never enforced. Socrates tells us that in the fifth century the custom of the Church in Greece, Macedonia, and Thessaly was peculiar, as those clergy who continued the use of marriage after ordination were degraded; whereas elsewhere in the East there was no rule against this, and "there have been among them many bishops who have had children by their lawful wives during their Episcopate."⁴ In process of time this liberty was no longer conceded to *bishops*, but for priests and deacons it has remained intact to the present day. The Council in Trullo (692) speaks strongly on the subject, and notes the divergence between the East and West in this matter. "As we know that the Roman Church has ruled that candidates for the diaconate or the presbyterate are to make profession that they will no longer live with their wives, we, observing the ancient canon of apostolical perfection and order, declare that the marriages of all in holy orders are to be henceforth accounted valid, and we refuse to forbid cohabitation, and will not deprive them of conjugal intercourse at proper times. Therefore, if a man is found fit to be ordained subdeacon, deacon, or priest, he is not to be refused on the ground of living with his wife. Nor at the time of ordination is any one to be required to profess that he will abstain from inter-

¹ Canon ii. Hefele, *op. cit.* p. 390.

² I. Toledo (Canon i.) in 400, Hefele, p. 419; and IX. Toledo (Canon x.) in 655, Hefele, iv. p. 473.

³ II. Arles (Canon xlv.) in 452, and I. Mâcon (Canon xi.), Hefele, p. 404.

⁴ Socrates, *H. E.* V. c. xxii.

course with his lawful wife; lest we thus do dishonour to marriage, which was instituted by God and blessed by His presence. . . . If, then, any one, in despite of the apostolic canons, be induced to forbid priests, deacons, and subdeacons to live with their lawful wives and hold intercourse with them, let him be deposed. And likewise, if any priest or deacon dismisses his wife on the pretext of piety, let him be excommunicated; and if he be obstinate, let him be deposed.”¹ The present custom in the East is for bishops to be always selected from the ranks of the monks and unmarried clergy. But to others, both priests and deacons, marriage before ordination is freely conceded.

(b) With regard to the second question raised above, Was marriage *after* ordination regarded as permissible in the early Church? it must be candidly admitted that there is very little evidence for an answer in the affirmative, and that the prohibition of marriage to the clergy appears in very early days. The fierce attack of Hippolytus upon Callistus (c. 220) shows that early in the third century it was not usual to permit those already ordained to marry; for Hippolytus says that Callistus determined that “if any one of the clergy should marry, he might remain in the clergy as not having sinned,” evidently implying that it was the first time that such a thing had been allowed.² The apostolical canons permit marriage only to readers and singers.³ The Council of Ancyra (314) allows deacons to marry, provided that they had given notice of their intention to do so at the time of their ordination.⁴ That of Neo-Cæsarea provides that “if a priest marry, he shall be removed from the

¹ Canon xiii. See Hefele, vol. v. p. 226.

² See Wordsworth's *Hippolytus*, p. 91.

³ Canon xxv. See Hefele, vol. i. p. 468.

⁴ Canon x. See Hefele, vol. i. p. 210.

ranks of the clergy";¹ and the rule of the Roman Synod under Innocent (402) is absolute: "Bishops, priests, and deacons must remain unmarried."²

In spite, however, of these canons, and of the growing feeling against the ministrations of a married clergy, a strict rule of clerical celibacy was found very difficult of enforcement, and in the eleventh century married clergy were still common. Gregory VII. set his face vigorously against them, and under his influence more stringent rules than ever were made. At a Synod held in Rome in 1074 he passed a decree which "in its inexorable provisions went beyond the sternest of his predecessors," absolutely forbidding the laity to avail themselves of the ministrations of married priests.³ The rigour of Gregory's rule was somewhat mitigated in England by the good sense of Lanfranc, as the Council of Winchester (1076), while absolutely forbidding marriage to the capitular clergy, ordered that the married priests who were scattered up and down the country in towns and villages should not be compelled to dismiss their wives, though for the future no married men were to be ordained.⁴ A few years later, under Anselm, a stricter law was framed at the Council of Westminster (1102), and an absolute rule of celibacy "became for the first time the universal law of the English Church."⁵

But it was one thing to frame rules on this subject and quite another to enforce them, and there is much

¹ Canon i. See Hefele, vol. i. p. 223.

² Canon iii. See Hefele, vol. ii. p. 429.

³ Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. iv. p. 31: "Uxoratos sacerdotes a divino officio removit, et laicis missam eorum audire interdixit, *novo exemplo*, et (ut multis visum est) inconsiderato prejudicio contra sanctorum patrum sententiam," etc. Sigebert (Pertz, vol. vi. p. 362).

⁴ Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. i. p. 367; cf. Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. iv. p. 423.

⁵ Freeman, vol. v. p. 223; and see Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. i. p. 382.

painful evidence that "the newly-devised rigour only led to laxity of a worse kind than any which it was intended to stop."¹ Clerical concubinage was only too common, and was often secretly permitted by ecclesiastical authority.² And the evil results of the stringent rules were so patent that in the sixteenth century Reformers of various schools of thought were all agreed on the necessity for some relaxation of them; and even before any alteration had been made in the law on the subject, clerical marriages were by no means uncommon.³ Thus Cranmer himself, whose first wife had died before his ordination in 1523, contracted a second marriage in 1532, very shortly before his elevation to the Archiepiscopate. It is impossible to defend such an act on his part, since at this time there had been no relaxation made by the ecclesiastical authorities in the law of the national Church; and naturally Cranmer was involved in considerable difficulties by his act. In 1539 Convocation, in answer to questions submitted by Cromwell, asserted that "priests, after the order of priesthood received, as afore, may not marry by the law of God,"⁴ and the statement was embodied in the statute of the Six Articles ("the whip with six strings") of the same year. The "Bishops' Book" of 1537 had passed over the subject in silence; but in the "King's Book" of 1543 it was stated that the estate of matrimony "is not commanded as necessary to any particular man, but left at liberty to all men, *saving priests*, and to others, which of their free liberty, by vow advisedly made, have chosen the state of continency, who, according to their free

¹ Freeman, *ubi supra*.

² See the horrible story told by Gascoygne in the fifteenth century, *Liber Veritatis*, p. 35 (ed. Rogers).

³ See Strype's *Cranmer*, Bk. I. c. xviii.

⁴ Wilkins, vol. iii. p. 845; cf. Dixon, ii. p. 133.

choice, must freely and willingly continue in the same.”¹ Shortly afterwards, however, a change was made in the law on this matter. In 1547, soon after the accession of Edward VI., a large majority of the Convocation agreed to the following: “That all such canons, laws, statutes, decrees, usages, and customs, heretofore made, had or used, that forbid any person to contract matrimony, or condemn matrimony already contracted by any person, for any vow or promise of priesthood, chastity, or widowhood, shall from henceforth cease, be utterly void, and of none effect.”² At the same time the statute of the Six Articles was repealed. Two years later, in 1549, any doubts as to the legality of the marriage of the clergy were set at rest by an Act of Parliament which repealed all the positive laws and canons which stood against it, and declared all to be free to marry, provided that it was according to the rites of the new Prayer Book;³ and in 1553, and again in 1563, the decision of the Church as to the freedom of the clergy to marry was embodied in the series of Articles. There is no need to pursue the subject further.⁴ It is quite clear from what has been said above that there is no law of God which forbids the marriage of the clergy. Any prohibition of their right to marry which may be cited (and it has been shown that such can be quoted from comparatively early days) is merely a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, and belongs to those “traditions of the Church” which “may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s word” (Art. XXXIV.). The experience of several

¹ *Formularies of Faith*, p. 293.

² Strype’s *Cranmer*, Bk. II. c. iv.

³ 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 21; cf. Dixon, vol. iii. p. 6 *seq.*

⁴ Mention may be made of Elizabeth’s “Injunctions” of 1559, which require the clergy to obtain the bishop’s permission before marriage.—Cardwell’s *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 224.

centuries had shown to our Reformers the grave evils that flowed from the rigid rule which had been customary; and they were perfectly justified in holding that the national Church was competent to settle the matter for herself, and that she was well within her rights in altering her rule.¹

¹ It may be added that the subject was considered at Trent in the twenty-fourth session (November 1563), when the following canon was passed: "Si quis dixerit Clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege Ecclesiastica, vel voto, et oppositum nil aliud esse, quam damnare matrimonium, posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum, anathema sit: cum Deus id recte petentibus non denegat, nec patiatur nos supra id, quod possumus, tentari."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxiv. c. ix. According to this, any one who says that the clergy in holy orders can marry is to be anathema. This makes it very difficult for Rome ever to review her position, or for Roman ecclesiastics to hold any opinion favourable to a relaxation of their existing rule. See the *Church Historical Lectures*, Series i. p. 68.

ARTICLE XXXIII

De excommunicatis Vitandis.

Qui per publicam Ecclesiæ denunciationem rite ab unitate Ecclesiæ præcisus est et excommunicatus, is ab universa fidelium multitudine, donec per poenitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit, arbitrio judicis competentis, habendus est tanquam Ethnicus et Publicanus.

Of excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled unto the Church by a judge that hath authority thereto.

EXCEPT for a slight alteration in the form of the title,¹ there has been no change in this Article since it was first published in 1553. There is nothing to suggest this Article in the Confession of Augsburg, and though the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* contains a long section of sixteen chapters—"De Excommunicatione"—there is nothing in it corresponding to the language of the Article before us, and its provisions are only of historical interest, as they never obtained any legal force. The object of the Article is to assert the right of the Church to exercise discipline, and to exclude unworthy members from the body. Such a right is inherent in a visible society such as the Church claims to be. Indeed the very notion of a definite society, with its rules and officers, implies the existence of a

¹ Excommunicati vitandi sunt. Excommunicate persons are to be avoided. 1553 and 1563.

power to decide upon the terms of membership, and to expel disloyal and improper persons. This power we find was exercised by the Jewish Church. It is foreshadowed in the words used when first circumcision is established as the sign of the covenant: "The uncircumcised man-child . . . shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken My covenant" (Gen. xvii. 14). The same threat is repeated in connection with the command to observe the Sabbath in Ex. xxxi. 14, and there is coupled with a command to inflict capital punishment on the transgressor.¹ As might be expected, a more definite reference to something like a formal sentence of excommunication is found after the return from the Captivity, when Ezra made proclamation "that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and elders, all his substance should be forfeited (מָרְקָה, ἀναθεματισθήσεται), and himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away" (Ezra x. 8). And from this time onwards exclusion from the congregation (ἐκκλησία) took its place among the Jews as a recognised method of enforcing discipline. As such it is frequently referred to in the New Testament. See S. Luke vi. 22 (ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς); S. John ix. 22 (ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται), xii. 42, xvi. 2.² And that our Lord intended

¹ See also Ex. xii. 15, 19, xxx. 33, 38; Lev. vii. 20, etc. Its proper meaning, according to Delitzsch, is the "being snatched away by direct Divine judgment" (*New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. ii. p. 36). Temporary exclusion from the congregation was, however, definitely ordered by the law in certain cases, e.g. in the case of Miriam, Num. xii. 14, 15, ἀφορισθήτω ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, and in the case of the leper, Lev. xiii. 5 seq. (ἀφοριεῖ).

² It is generally stated that there were three stages of Jewish excommunication (to which our Lord's words, ἀφορίσωσιν, δνειδίσωσιν, ἐκβάλωσιν, in S. Luke vi. 22, are thought to correspond), viz. יָרָה, separation; מָרְקָה, or ἀνάθεμα, a severer sentence, involving additional penalties and accompanied by a solemn malediction; and מַרְפָּשׁ, an entire cutting off

that such a power should be exercised by the Church which He came to found is shown by the very definite words which He Himself used in speaking of the erring brother, when He gave to His Church the power of binding and loosing.

“If thy brother sin against thee, go show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican” (S. Matt. xviii. 15–17).

This is the great passage on which the Church has always based her claim to exercise such discipline; and in close accordance with its terms she has always held that the sentence should not be inflicted without warning, and that the effect of private expostulation must first be tried.

Passing from the Gospels to the Epistles, we find various allusions to the existence of the power of excommunication in the Church, and two clear cases of the exercise of the power by the Apostle Paul. The first of these is that of the incestuous man at Corinth. In regard to him S. Paul writes as follows: “Ye are puffed up, and did not rather mourn, that he that had done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as though I were present, judged him

from the congregation. Schürer, however, shows that this is a mistake, and that שָׁמַר and נָרִי are really synonymous, so that in reality only two kinds can be distinguished, נָרִי or temporary exclusion, and the קָרַם or permanent ban (*ἀνάθεμα*). *The Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Div. II. vol. ii. p. 60.

that hath so wrought this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus, . . . to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened" (1 Cor. v. 2-7).

The whole passage is especially instructive. It not only shows us the infliction of a solemn judicial sentence of exclusion from the body of the faithful (the phrase "to deliver to Satan" is explained below), but it further explains the reasons for it. It was inflicted partly for the sake of the faithful generally, to save the body from the danger of the evil influence spreading further,¹ partly also for the sake of the individual, that the temporal judgments inflicted upon him might bring him to a better mind, and so "the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is generally thought to contain the conclusion of the history. The offender was overwhelmed with sorrow, and brought to a true repentance. Accordingly S. Paul pronounces his punishment "sufficient," and writes to the Corinthians to "forgive him and comfort him, lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow," adding these words: "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for what I also have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ" (2 Cor. ii. 5-11).²

¹ Godet, however, denies altogether that vers. 6-8 bear on the subject of the incestuous man. *Comment. in loc.*, and see Ellicott, *in loc.*

² It ought to be said that some writers hold that this passage refers to the case of an entirely different person from the man spoken of in 1 Cor. v. See Godet, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, vol. i. p. 259.

The other case of formal excommunication by S. Paul is that of Hymenæus and Alexander, who had "made shipwreck concerning the faith"; "whom," says the Apostle, "I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 19, 20).¹

It will be noticed that in both these cases the same expression is employed—"to deliver to Satan." It has been doubted whether (1) this denotes simple excommunication, regarded as the reversal of that translation from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God, which had taken place when the persons referred to had been admitted into the Church, or whether (2) something more is implied, as the authoritative infliction of bodily disease or death. On the whole, remembering the language used elsewhere by S. Paul on the power of darkness which worketh in the children of disobedience,² there seems to be no sufficient reason to think that anything more than the penalty of excommunication is intended.³ But, however this may be, the later Church never ventured to adopt the formula in inflicting her sentences.⁴

Although these are the only two cases of actual excommunication mentioned in the New Testament, there are several apostolic precepts which bear directly upon the subject, and furnish ample warrant for the exercise of the power by the Church in later ages. Of these the most important are the following:—

¹ If the Hymenæus who taught that the resurrection was already passed (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18) be the same person, we should gather that in his case the sentence failed to bring him to repentance.

² See especially Col. i. 12, 13; Eph. ii. 1-6, vi. 12; Acts xxvi. 18.

³ It is possible, however, that such powers as those exercised by the Apostles on Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1 *seq.*) and Elymas (xiii. 10) may be referred to.

⁴ See Bingham, *Antiquities*, Bk. xvi. c. ii.; and for patristic comments on the phrase, cf. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v. *Σατανᾶς*.

Rom. xvi. 17: "Mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and turn away from them."

2 Thess. iii. 14: "If any man obeyeth not our word by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed."

Titus iii. 10: "A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned."

2 John 10: "If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works."¹

To these should be added the passage in the Epistle to the Galatians in which S. Paul says of any one, whether angel or man, who should preach another gospel, "let him be accursed" (*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*), Gal. i. 8, 9; and 1 Cor. xvi. 22: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema. Maranatha"; for though the phrase refers to spiritual condition rather than to ecclesiastical censure, yet it certainly suggested the later ecclesiastical sense in which the word meant "excommunicated."²

With, then, the very definite command of her Lord before her, and guided by the practice and injunctions of the Apostle, it is no wonder that the Christian Church from the first felt it right to exclude unworthy members from Communion, and that gradually there grew up a method of formal excommunication, with an elaborate system of penitential discipline to be undergone before the excommunicated person could be restored to the peace of the Church. The well-known stories of S.

¹ It may be added that 3 John 10 possibly implies a power of excommunication, which was wrongly used by Diotrephes.

² See Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 77.

John fleeing from the bath when the heretic Cerinthus entered, with the exclamation that he feared lest the bath might fall in when Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, was within, and of Polycarp refusing to acknowledge Marcion except as "the first-born of Satan," testify to a determination to hold no communion with heretics.¹ In the third century S. Cyprian speaks expressly of those who were guilty of heinous sins being forbidden Communion, and separated from the body of Christ;² and the troubles which arose in connection with those who had lapsed during the Decian persecution brought the whole subject prominently before the Church, and compelled her to consider carefully the terms on which readmission to Church privileges might be granted. Rather later than this we come across indications of the division of penitents into distinct classes, with a separate discipline for each;³ and though the particular system has varied from time to time, being administered sometimes publicly,⁴ sometimes privately,⁵ the Church has, through all changes, claimed the right to decide on her

¹ Both stories are told in Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* III. iii.

² *De Oratone Dominica*, c. xviii.

³ Thus the Councils of Neo-Cæsarea (A.D. 314) and Ancyra (314) refer to the *βαθμοί* of penance as if they were well known, and allude to the stages by name (see Neo-Cæs. 5, Ancyra. 4, etc.). The four stages, according to the complete system, which was, however, seldom enforced, are these — (1) Mourners, *flentes*, *προσκλαυοντες*; (2) hearers, *audientes*, *ακροώμενοι*; (3) kneelers, *substrati*, *ὑποκλιπτοντες*; (4) bystanders, *consistentes*, *συνισταμένοι*. See the article "Penitence" in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 1591 *seq.*, with the references there given.

⁴ Thus from the time of the Novatian schism until the days of Nectarius, 391, there was at Byzantium a public officer termed the Penitentiary, whose duty it was to determine what offences excluded from Holy Communion, and what crimes were too scandalous for public acknowledgment. See Socrates, *H. E.* V. xix., and Sozomen, VII. xvi.

⁵ On the decline of public penance, and the introduction of the "Penitentials," see *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 1596.

terms of Communion, to reject the unworthy, and exclude them from fellowship, and also, on their repentance, to admit them once more and remove the sentence.¹ There is no need here to give the history of the penitential discipline of the Church, and of the various changes through which it passed.² It will be sufficient to notice how the claim to exercise it was preserved and reasserted in the Church of England in the sixteenth century. We have already seen how the right use of ecclesiastical discipline was generally mentioned among the notes of the Church in the various descriptions and definitions of it that were drawn up.³ Very clear is the statement of the Catechism which was issued with the Articles in 1553, and which gives as the last of the marks of the Church "brotherly correction and excommunication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend their lives. This mark the holy Fathers termed discipline."⁴ Equally clear is the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer.

Excommunications are to be publicly read out in church after the Nicene Creed.⁵ The Office for the Burial of the Dead is not to be used for those that die excommunicate;⁶ and precise rules are laid down direct-

¹ For the medieval forms of pronouncing excommunication and of reconciliation, see Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesie Ritibus*, Lib. III. c. iv. v.

² Reference may be made to the great work of Morinus, *De Disciplina in Administr. Sacram. Penit.*; Bingham's *Antiquities*, Bks. xvi. and xvii.; Marshall's *Penitential Discipline*; as well as to the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, arts. "Excommunication" and "Penitence."

³ See above, pp. 495, 496.

⁴ See *Liturgies of Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 513.

⁵ "Briefs, Citations, and Excommunications read." Rubric after the Nicene Creed, dating from 1662.

⁶ "Here is to be noted that the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves." Rubric before the order for the Burial of the Dead. Although this rubric was only inserted in 1662, it simply embodies the

ing the curate to refuse to admit to Communion any "notorious evil liver," as well as "those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign." These "disciplinary rubrics" have stood before the Order of Holy Communion since 1549, with the exception of the final clause in the latter of them, which was only added at the last revision in 1662: "Provided that every minister so repelling any, as is specified in this or the next preceding paragraph of this rubric, shall be obliged to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after at the furthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the canon." The canon here referred to is the 109th of the series of 1604: "Notorious crimes and scandals to be certified into Ecclesiastical Courts by presentment." Nor is this the only canon in the series which bears upon the subject before us. A large number of others speak of excommunication as due to (1) impugnors of the laws relating to the Church;¹ (2) schismatics;² and (3) offenders generally against religion, morality, and good order in church.³ The sixty-fifth requires "ministers solemnly to denounce recusants and excommunicates"; and the sixty-eighth prohibits the clergy from refusing to use the Burial Office, "except the party deceased were denounced excommunicated, *majori excommunicatione*, for some grievous and notorious crime, and no man able to testify of his repentance." Thus this canon explicitly recognises the distinction, which has come down from comparatively early days, between two kinds of excommunication. What is called *the lesser excommunication* deprives the offender of the use of sacraments and

ancient rule of the Church. Cf. the Council of Braga (563), Canons xv. xvi. xvii. See Hefele, vol. iv. p. 385.

¹ Canons ii.-viii.

² Canons ix.-xii.

³ Canon cix.

Divine worship. It is inflicted by a formal sentence passed by judges ecclesiastical on such persons as are guilty of obstinacy or disobedience in not appearing upon a citation, or not submitting to penance or other injunction of the Court. By *the greater excommunication*, inflicted for graver offences against morality and faith, the offender is not only deprived of the use of the sacraments and benefits of Divine offices, but is further excluded from the society of the faithful. And it is clearly to this that the Article before us is referring, for it says that the excommunicated person **ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen and publican.** Such was and still remains the law of the Church; but the civil pains and penalties involved in excommunication, which rendered it so formidable a weapon, not only before but also after the Reformation, have been almost entirely extinguished. Matrimonial and other partly civil matters have been withdrawn from the Ecclesiastical Courts, and by Act of Parliament a summary process of signification for contempt of Court has been substituted for excommunication as a means of enforcing civil processes. But the Act which thus abolishes civil penalties attaching to excommunication says definitely that "nothing in this Act contained shall prevent any Ecclesiastical Court from pronouncing or declaring persons to be excommunicate in definitive sentences, or in interlocutory decrees having the force and effect of definitive sentences, such sentences and decrees being pronounced as spiritual censures for offences of ecclesiastical cognisance in the same manner as such Court might lawfully have pronounced or declared the same had this Act not been passed."¹ Thus the right of the Church to pronounce through her

¹ 53 George III. c. 127; and on the whole subject, so far as *legal* questions are concerned, see Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, p. 1417 *seq.*

proper courts and officers sentences of spiritual censure remains unimpaired, and though her disciplinary powers over the laity are but seldom exercised, yet circumstances may easily render a revival of them an absolute necessity. There is probably no desire on the part of any one that the *legal* consequences of excommunication should be revived, — it was largely owing to the disastrous confusion between things spiritual and secular that excommunication fell into such discredit,—but the restoration of something corresponding to the godly discipline of the primitive Church is, as we are reminded by the Communion Service every year, a thing that is “much to be wished.”

ARTICLE XXXIV

*De traditionibus Ecclesiasticis.*¹

Traditiones atque cæremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique aut prorsus consimiles. Nam et variæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituatur.

Traditiones et cæremonias ecclesiasticas quæ cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt autoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens et data opera publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, qui-que lædit auctoritatem magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quælibet ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi cæremonias aut ritus ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

Of the Traditions of the Church.

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like ; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that other may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

THE last paragraph of this Article ("Every particular or national Church," etc.) was added in 1563, as was also the single word "times" in the first sentence. With

¹ "Traditiones Ecclesiasticæ," 1553 and 1563.

these exceptions, it has remained unaltered since its first issue in 1553. Its language may be traced to a considerable extent to the fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, in which we find the following paragraphs:—

“Traditiones vero, et ritus, atque ceremoniæ, quæ vel ad decorem vel ordinem vel disciplinam Ecclesiæ ab hominibus sunt institutæ, non omnino necesse est ut eædem sint ubique aut prorsus similes. Hæc enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate, ubi decus, ordo, et utilitas Ecclesiæ videbuntur postulare:

“Hæ enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate, ubi decus decensque ordo principibus rectoribusque regionum videbuntur postulare; ita tamen ut nihil varietur aut instituatür contra verbum Dei manifestum.”¹

The clause added in 1563 seems to have been taken from a Latin series of twenty-four Articles, apparently drawn up by Parker in 1559; but “whether, from motives of prudence, or from inability to gain the sanction of the Crown,”² not circulated among the clergy. In this document we are told that “quævis ecclesia particularis auctoritatem instituendi, mutandi et abrogandi ceremonias et ritus ecclesiasticos habet, modo ad decorem, ordinem et ædificationem fiat.”³

The main object of this Article is, as against the Romanists, to assert the right of the Church of England to make such changes as were carried out in her “traditions and ceremonies” in the sixteenth century; and a further object is to insist upon the duty of loyalty on the part of all members of the Church to those traditions

¹ See Hardwick, p. 264. We may be thankful that the characteristically Erastian reference to “princes and the rulers of countries” was not adopted in the Anglican formulary.

² Hardwick, p. 118.

³ See Strype, *Annals*, i. p. 216.

and ceremonies which were ordained and approved by common authority. This was rendered necessary, not only by the entire rejection of all authority by the Anabaptists, but by the way in which some among the English clergy, who were very far from sympathising doctrinally with these fanatics, were prepared to take the law into their own hands, and discard such ceremonies as they disapproved of.¹ These men were the ecclesiastical ancestors of the "Nonconformists" of Elizabeth's reign—men who would not secede, and who denounced the "separatists," but claimed to set at defiance the laws and regulations of the Church in which they ministered²

There are three principal positions maintained in the Article—

1. There is no need for traditions and ceremonies to be everywhere alike.

2. Those persons are deserving of censure who break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which are ordained by common authority.

3. Every particular or national Church is competent to arrange her own ceremonies and rites.

Of these the first and third statements have been already considered in connection with Article XX., and it will be sufficient to refer the reader to what was there said. Nor does the second appear to require any lengthy proof. The position of the Church of England with regard to "ceremonies, why some be abolished and some

¹ Of these men Hooper was the leader. His objection to the Episcopal habit, and the difficulty about his consecration in consequence, is well known (see Dixon, vol. iii. p. 213 *seq.*); and it must be owned that considerable encouragement was given to this party by Ridley's utterly illegal onslaught upon "altars" in 1550. See Dixon, vol. iii. p. 200 *seq.*

² In the Lower House of Convocation a vigorous attempt was made in 1563 to have the terms of this Article softened in the interests of the Puritans, and the attempt only narrowly escaped being successful. See Strype, *Annals*, i. p. 335 *seq.*

retained," is clearly stated in the section with this heading at the beginning of the Book of Common Prayer (dating from 1549). In this we read that "although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing, yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. *Let all things be done among you, saith Saint Paul, in a seemly and due order*: the appointment of the which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any publick or common order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorised thereunto."

It is obvious that unless such a position as this is conceded, nothing can result except confusion and disorder. No better example of this can be given than the extraordinary state of things which existed in Elizabeth's reign before the vigorous efforts of Parker, and subsequently of Whitgift, had succeeded in enforcing a certain degree of order and conformity to law.¹ Naturally this

¹ See the contemporary Paper prepared for Cecil in 1564, now among the Lansdowne MSS., vol. viii. art. 7: "Varietees in y^e service, and ye administracion used."

"*Service and Prayer*s.—Some say y^e service and pray^{rs} in y^e chauncell, others in y^e body of y^e church, some say y^e same in a seate made in y^e church; some in y^e Pulpitt, wth y^r faces to y^e people.

"Some kepe precysly y^e order of y^e booke, oth^{rs} intermeddle Psal. in meter.

"Some say wth a surpless, others w^{thout} a surplesse.

"*Table*.—The Table standeth in y^e body of y^e church in some places, in others hit standeth in y^e chauncell.

"In some places the Table standeth Alterlyke distant from y^e walle a yarde, in some others in y^e midst of y^e chauncell north and south.

"In some places the Table ys joyned, in others hit standeth uppon Trestells.

"In some y^e Table hath a carpett, in others hit hath none.

"*Administration of y^e Co[m]munion*.—Some wth surpless and copes, some with surpless alone, others with none.

Thirty-fourth Article was not much to the mind of the Nonconforming party, although they were able to evade its force, and to reconcile their conscience to the act of subscription to it by pleading that everything which they disliked was "repugnant to the word of God."¹

This is not the place to enter into the history of the controversy, which is really chiefly important because it was the occasion of Hooker's magnificent work. Nor does it appear necessary to say more here than to remind the reader of the four propositions which Hooker claims to have granted "concerning matters of outward form in the exercise of true religion."

"(1) In the external form of religion such things as are apparently or can be sufficiently proved, effectual and generally fit to set forward godliness, either as betokening the greatness of God, or as beseeeming the dignity of religion, or as concurring with celestial impressions in the minds of men, may be reverently thought of; some few, rare, casual and tolerable, or otherwise curable, inconveniences notwithstanding.

"(2) In things the fitness whereof is not of itself apparent, nor easy to be made sufficiently manifest unto all, yet the judgment of antiquity concurring with that which is received may induce them to think it not unfit

"Some wth chalice, some wth a Co[m]mun[i]on Cuppe, others wth a como[n] Cuppe.

"Some wth unleavened Bread, some wth leavened.

"*Receaving*.—Some receave kneeling, others standing, others sytting.

"*Baptising*.—Some baptise in a fount, some in a Bason.

"Some signed wth y^e signe of y^e Crosse, others not signed.

"Some minister in a surpless, others without.

"*Apparell*.—Some with a square Cappe, some with a round Capp.

Some wth a Button Cappe, some wth a Hatte.

"Some in Schol^{rs} Clooke, some in others."

The document is printed in full in Parker's *Postscript to a Letter to Lord Selborne*, p. 148.

¹ See Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 110.

who are not able to allege any known weighty inconvenience which it hath, or to take any strong objection against it.

“(3) Where neither the evidence of any law Divine, nor the strength of any invincible argument otherwise found out by the light of reason, nor any notable public inconvenience, doth make against that which our own laws ecclesiastical have although but newly instituted for the ordering of these affairs, the very authority of the Church itself, at least in such cases, may give so much credit to her laws, as to make their sentence touching fitness and conveniency weightier than any bare and naked conceit to the contrary; especially in them who can owe no less than childlike obedience to her that hath more than motherly power.

“(4) In cases of necessity, or for common utility's sake, certain profitable ordinances some time may be released, rather than all men always be strictly bound to the general rigour thereof.”¹

These propositions, Hooker fairly claims, are “such as no man of moderate judgment hath cause to think unjust or unreasonable”; and if they be admitted, they appear to be fully sufficient to establish the position taken up in the Article before us.

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V. c. vi.-ix.

ARTICLE XXXV

De Homiliis.

Tomus secundus Homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic Articulo subjunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et his temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior Tomus Homiliarum quæ editæ sunt tempore Edwardi sexti. Itaque eas in ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clare, ut a populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse judicamus.

Catalogus Homiliarum.

De recto ecclesiæ usu.
Adversus Idolatriæ pericula.
De reparandis ac purgandis ecclesiis.
De bonis operibus.
De jejuniis.
In gulæ atque ebrietatis vitia.
In nimis sumptuosis vestium apparatus.
De oratione sive precatatione.
De loco et tempore orationi destinatis.
De publicis precibus ac Sacramentis, idiomate vulgari omnibusque noto, habendis.
De sacrosancta verbi divini auctoritate.
De eleemosina.
De Christi Nativitate.
De dominica passione.
De resurrectione Domini.

Of Homilies.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth: and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood by the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1. Of the right use of the Church.
2. Against peril of Idolatry.
3. Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
4. Of good works, first of fasting.
5. Against gluttony and drunkenness.
6. Against excess of apparel.
7. Of prayer.
8. Of the place and time of prayer.
9. That common prayers and sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.
10. Of the reverend estimation of God's word.
11. Of almsdoing.
12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
13. Of the Passion of Christ.
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

De digna corporis et sanguinis dominici in cœna Domini par- ticipatione.	15. Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.
De donis Spiritus Sancti.	16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.
In diebus, qui vulgo Rogationum dicti sunt, concio.	17. For the Rogation Days.
De matrimonii statu.	18. Of the state of matrimony.
De otio seu socordia.	19. Of repentance.
De pœnitentia.	20. Against idleness.
	21. Against rebellion.

SLIGHT verbal alterations of no importance were introduced into the English of this Article in 1571, when the mention of the twenty-first Homily "Against rebellion" (which had only just been issued), was added. But except for these the Article dates from 1563. The corresponding Article in the series of Edward's reign, of course, only referred to the *first* book, and without giving a list of them, merely stated that "The Homilies of late given, and set out by the King's authority, be godly and wholesome, containing doctrine to be received of all men, and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly."

In considering this Article it will be well to consider separately—

1. The history of the Homilies.
2. The nature of the assent demanded to them.

I. *The History of the Homilies.*

The earliest mention of the Homilies is in 1542, when a certain number of them were introduced in Convocation with the design of having them promulgated and set forth by authority.¹ The design miscarried, and we hear nothing more of them until after the death of Henry VIII. But in the first year of Edward VI. the scheme was taken up again, and what is now known as

¹ Strype's *Cranmer*, Bk. II. c. iii.

the first Book of the Homilies was printed and authorised by Royal authority, being ordered to be read in churches every Sunday after High Mass. The book contained twelve Homilies, with the following titles :—

- (1) A fruitful Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture.
- (2) Of the Misery of all Mankind.
- (3) Of the Salvation of all Mankind.
- (4) Of the True and Lively Faith.
- (5) Of Good Works.
- (6) Of Christian Love and Charity.
- (7) Against Swearing and Perjury.
- (8) Of the Declining from God.
- (9) An Exhortation against the Fear of Death.
- (10) An Exhortation to Obedience.
- (11) Against Whoredom and Adultery.
- (12) Against Strife and Contention.

The authorship of the whole number has not been ascertained, but probably the first, on the Reading of Holy Scripture, and certainly the third, fourth, and fifth, of Salvation, of Faith, and of Good Works, come from the pen of Cranmer. The sixth, on Charity, is by Bonner; the second, on the Misery of Mankind, by his chaplain, Hartsfield; and it is said that the eleventh is by Becon.

In 1549, in order to render them more acceptable to the people, they were subdivided into thirty-two parts, and the Prayer Book, which had just been published, directed that “after the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided.” That the book was only intended as an instalment, is shown by the following note which stood at the close of it: “Hereafter shall follow Sermons of Fasting, Praying, Alms deeds; of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our

Saviour Christ; of the due receiving of His blessed body and blood under the form of bread and wine; against Idleness, against Gluttony and Drunkenness, against Covetousness, against Envy, Ire, and Malice; with many other matters as well fruitful as necessary to the edifying of Christian people and the increase of godly living." Accordingly the rubric in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) said that "After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by common authority." The death of the king, however, occurred before anything more was done. Shortly after the accession of Elizabeth the Book of the Homilies was reprinted (1560), and in 1563 a second book was added to it, presented to Convocation, and after some considerable delay authorised by the Sovereign.¹ Meanwhile, as we have seen, the Article was rewritten, and made to refer to the second book as well as the first. The direction in it, that **they are to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people**, should be noticed. It was rendered necessary by the dislike with which the Homilies were regarded by many of the clergy, who revenged themselves by reading them unintelligibly. The dislike was not confined to one party in the Church, for we find that in the "Admonition to Parliament" in 1571 one of the demands of the Puritans is this: "Remove *Homylies*, Articles, Injunctions."²

The second book, which contains twenty-one Homilies in forty-three parts, professes to supply "Homilies of such matters as were promised and entituled in the former part of Homilies"; but, as a matter of fact, those

¹ See Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 177.

² For the Puritan objections to the reading of Homilies in church, see Rogers *On the XXXIX. Articles*, p. 326 (Parker Society).

actually provided do not correspond exactly to the list of those promised at the close of the first book. Thus there are no Homilies expressly treating of Covetousness, Envy, Ire, and Malice; while there are several which were seemingly not contemplated when the first book was issued. The writer who is supposed to have had the chief hand in the preparation of the book is Bishop Jewel, but a considerable number of the Homilies were only translations or adaptations of works that had previously been issued. Thus those on the Passion and Resurrection are taken from Taverner's Postils, which had appeared so early as 1540. That on Matrimony is taken half from Veit Dietrick, of Nuremberg, half from S. Chrysostom; and two-thirds of the first part of that on Repentance are translated from Randolph Gualther. The Preface, or "Admonition to all ministers ecclesiastical," was from the pen of Bishop Cox. It should be added that the last Homily, viz. that against Disobedience and wilful Rebellion, was only added in 1571; the occasion which called it forth being the rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, which had taken place shortly before (1569), and to which the Homily itself clearly alludes.

II. *The Nature of the Assent demanded to the Homilies.*

The statement of the Article is that the Book of Homilies **doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times.** It is obvious from this that the assent demanded to them is of a very general character, and cannot be held to bind us to the acceptance of every statement made in them. Nothing whatever is said about the *historical* statements contained in them, some of which are highly questionable, or even demonstrably false. And as to the doctrine, all

that is asserted is that they “*contain* a godly and wholesome doctrine.” On one subject certainly their teaching appears to be invested with a peculiar authority, viz. that of justification, owing to the express reference to them in Article XI. But on other matters a wide discretion is left to the individual, and he cannot fairly be called upon to maintain any particular view simply because it is taught in the Homilies. The formal doctrinal teaching of the Church of England is found in the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer; and so far as the Homilies agree with these, and bring out the sense of their teaching, they are authoritative. But that is all. So much is confessed by all parties, and it has been frequently pointed out that it is impossible to tie persons down rigidly to the acceptance of every doctrinal proposition contained in these thirty-three sermons.¹ The matter is well put by Bishop Montague in his *Appello Cæsarem*, published in 1625—

“I willingly admit the *Homilies* as containing certain *godly* and *wholesome exhortations* to move the people to honour and worship Almighty God; but not as the *public dogmatical resolutions* confirmed of the Church of England. The XXXVth Article giveth them to contain *godly* and *wholesome Doctrine*, and *necessary for these times*: which they may do, though they have not *dogmatical positions*, or *doctrine* to be *propugned* and *subscribed* in all and every point, as the Books of *Articles* and of *Common Prayer* have. They may seem, secondly, to speak somewhat too hardly, and stretch some sayings beyond the use and practice of the Church of *England*, both then and now; and yet what they speak may receive a fair, or at least a tolerable construction and mitigation enough.”²

Still more important, as being of the nature of a

¹ See especially *Tracts for the Times*, Nos. lxxxii. and xc.

² *Appello Cæsarem*, p. 260.

judicial decision upon this very point, is the statement of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust in his judgment in the Arches Court of Canterbury on Nov. 19, 1838. The question before him was whether the Church of England regarded praying for the dead as an illegal practice; and the authority of the Homilies had been quoted against it.¹ The judge entered fully into the matter, and decided that "it seemed clearly to have been the intention of the composer of the Homily to discourage the practice of praying for the dead; but it does not appear that in any part of the Homily he declares the practice to be an unlawful one." And then he adds the following important statement: "But supposing he had been of opinion that such prayers were unlawful, it is not to be necessarily inferred that the Church of England adopted every part of the doctrines contained in the Homilies."²

¹ See the third part of the *Homily* Concerning Prayer, p. 355 (S.P.C.K. ed.).

² The judgment is given in full in Lee's *Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed*, Appendix XII.

ARTICLE XXXVI

De Episcoporum et Ministrorum Consecratione.

Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum et de ordinatione Presbyterorum et Diaconorum æditus nuper temporibus Edwardi sexti, et auctoritate Parlamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad ejusmodi consecrationem et ordinationem necessaria continet, et nihil habet quod ex se sit aut superstitiosum aut impium. Itaque quicumque juxta ritus illius libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt ab anno secundo prædicti Regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum juxta eosdem ritus consecrabuntur aut ordinabuntur rite, ordine, atque legitime, statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering: neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforesaid King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

IN its present form this Article dates from 1563, when it was entirely rewritten. The corresponding Article in the Edwardian Series was of a much more general character, referring to the Book of Common Prayer as a whole, and not only to the Ordinal.

Of the Book of Prayers and Ceremonies of the Church of England.

“The Book which of very late time was given to the Church of England by the King’s authority and the

Parliament, containing the manner and form of praying, and ministering the sacraments in the Church of England, likewise also the book of Ordering Ministers of the Church, set forth by the foresaid authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel, but agreeable thereunto, furthering and beautifying the same not a little; and therefore of all faithful members of the Church of England, and chiefly of the ministers of the word, they ought to be received, and allowed with all readiness of mind, and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the people of God.”¹

As originally drafted and signed by the royal chaplains, it had contained some words referring expressly to the *ceremonies* of the book as in no way repugnant to the liberty of the Gospel, but rather agreeable to it, and tending to promote it. To this serious objection was taken by John Knox, whose dislike of the ceremonies ordered in the book was perhaps not unnatural; and it is probable that it was in consequence of his remonstrances that all that part which referred especially to the ceremonies was omitted before publication.²

¹ “De libro precationum et cæremoniarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Liber qui nuperrime auctoritate Regis et Parlamenti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ traditus est, continens modum et formam orandi, et sacramenta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana: Similiter et libellus eadem auctoritate editus de ordinatione ministorum ecclesiæ, quoad doctrinæ veritatem, pii sunt, et salutari doctrinæ Evangelii in nullo repugnant sed congruunt, et eandem non parum promovent et illustrent, atque ideo ab omnibus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ fidelibus membris, et maxime a ministris verbi cum omni promptitudine animorum et gratiarum actione, recipiendi, approbandi, et populo Dei commendandi sunt.”

² The clause in question appears in this form in the MS. signed by the royal chaplains: “*Et quoad cæremoniarum rationem salutari Evangelii libertati, si ex sua natura cæremonie illæ æstimentur, in nullo repugnant, sed probe congruunt, et eandem in complurimis imprimis promovent, atque ideo,*” etc. The words in italics were altogether omitted or modified in the published Article. For the part taken by Knox in securing the change, see vol. i. p. 14, with the references there given.

As it now stands, the object of the Article is to assert emphatically the validity of Anglican Orders, and this against objections raised from two opposite quarters. On the one hand, the "Nonconformist" and Puritan party denounced the Ordinal as containing in it things that were of themselves **superstitious or ungodly**; on the other hand, the disaffected Romanists might deny that the form used could be said to **contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering**. And thus, as against both parties, it was deemed advisable to assert definitely that **whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.**

The principal subjects, then, to be treated of here are these—

1. The objections of the Puritans.
2. The objections of the Romanists.

I. The Objections of the Puritans.

Since many of those who objected to the Ordinal, as containing that which was "superstitious and ungodly," objected not only to the special formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc., used in conferring orders on the priesthood (which they denounced as "manifest blasphemy"), but also to Episcopacy itself, it seems desirable to consider here—

- (a) The question of the threefold ministry.
- (b) The formula of Ordination.

(a) *The question of the threefold ministry.*—The Preface to the "Form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons according

to the order of the Church of England" (1550), begins with the statement that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The evidence for the existence of the threefold ministry, *from the second century onwards*, is so full and complete, that it is not likely to be questioned, and need not be summarised here. All that the opponents of Episcopacy can do is to endeavour to show that there are in later times a few possible exceptions to the rule,¹ and to deny that it is found in the New Testament, and can be traced back to "the Apostles' time." It will be well, therefore, to examine the evidence of the New Testament, and for this purpose it will be convenient to break up the Apostolic age into three distinct periods, each of which requires to be discussed separately.

(i.) The foundation of the Church. In this S. Peter is the most prominent figure, and the period is closed by his imprisonment and departure from Jerusalem in the year 44. Even at this early time we can discern the germs and beginnings of what afterwards grew into the threefold ministry. The Apostles are naturally the leaders and rulers of the Church, and at first its only ministers. But as the work grows under their hands some portion of it is delegated to the seven, who, though never called "deacons" in the Acts, are plainly the first representatives of that order, *selected* by the whole multitude of the faithful, but receiving their *appointments* from the Apostles (*οὓς καταστήσομεν*, "whom we may appoint," Acts vi. 3), and set apart for their office

¹ Of these the most important is the supposed exceptional constitution of the Alexandrian Church, on which see Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 134 *seq.*; and for supposed ordinations by presbyters in East and West, *ib.* p. 374.

with the imposition of hands and prayer (ver. 6).¹ Of the origin of what we term the *second* order of the ministry no account is given us, but by the end of this period we find it already in existence, for in Acts xi. 30 (just about the time of Peter's imprisonment or release) we read that the Christians at Antioch "determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa; which also they did, sending it to *the elders* (πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους) by the hand of Barnabas and Saul." This is the earliest mention of an order of ministers which we shall find appointed everywhere during the next period. Since its origin is nowhere related in the Acts (our sole authority for this period), it can only be a matter of conjecture. Possibly it was suggested to the Christian Church by the organisation of the Jewish communities, in which "the elders" occupied a recognised position.² However this may be, the fact remains that in this first period we find something fairly corresponding to our three orders of ministers, viz. Apostles, with the oversight of the whole Church, and,

¹ The reasons for maintaining that the appointment of the "seven" gives the origin of the diaconate are briefly these: (1) Although the title *διάκονος* does not occur, yet the corresponding verb and substantive (*διακονεῖν* and *διακονία*) are both used (vers. 1, 2). (2) The functions are substantially those exercised by the later deacons (cf. Lightfoot *On Philipp.* p. 186). (3) From the position of the narrative in the Acts and the emphasis laid on it by the writer, it is clear that he regarded it "not as an isolated incident, but as the establishment of a new order of things in the Church" (Lightfoot, *ubi supra*). (4) Tradition is unanimous as to the identity of the two offices, and that from the earliest times. See further, Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. 2), vol. i. p. 739.

² So Lightfoot *On Philipp.* p. 189, and cf. Gore, p. 399. But it is important to remember that, though the *name* was certainly borrowed from the synagogue, yet the functions of the Christian presbyters, as found in the writings of the New Testament and the earliest Fathers, mark out the office as really a new one of a spiritual character. For these functions see 1 Pet. v. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 2, v. 17; Titus i. 9; S. James v. 14; Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* xlv.

locally, elders and deacons. Indeed, we may go a step further, and maintain that something approaching to the *local* Episcopate already obtained in Jerusalem; for the message of S. Peter after his release from prison, when read in the light of later notices, is highly significant, "Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren" (Acts xii. 17). Why "unto *James*"? The only explanation is that he already occupied the position which we find him holding at a later period, of *president* of the local Church (see Acts xv. 13–21, xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 9, 12), or, as the tradition of the Church has ever regarded him, first bishop of Jerusalem.

(ii.) The second period is that of the organisation and extension of the Church. In it the prominent figure is the Apostle Paul, whose missionary labours formed the main instrument for planting the Church in various regions. The period is perhaps best closed, not by the Apostle's death, but by the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. Our authorities for it are the narrative in Acts xiii.–xxviii. and the apostolic Epistles. In it we trace the extension of the different orders of ministers as new Churches are founded.

For the *diaconate* we have the evidence of the Epistle to the Philippians (A.D. 60), which shows us two orders of resident ministers existing at Philippi, ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι (c. i. ver. 1). Still earlier (during S. Paul's second missionary journey), Rom. xvi. 1 shows us a woman deacon at Cenchreæ; and at a later period, after the Apostle's first imprisonment, 1 Tim. iii. 8 *seq.*, bears evidence of the extension of this order to the Church of Ephesus, though it is interesting to note that in the almost contemporary Epistle to Titus there is no mention of διάκονοι. It may, perhaps, be inferred from this that they were only appointed as the work grew, and the need for them was felt. In Ephesus, a Church which

had existed for some years (cf. Acts xx. 17), they were required. In the newly-founded Church in Crete the necessity for their help would not exist.

For the *second* order of the ministry as well the evidence during this period is full and complete. A representative passage is Acts xiv. 23: "When they had appointed for them elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." This refers to S. Paul's first missionary journey, but it clearly indicates a custom which he followed everywhere. Only, having once stated it, S. Luke does not concern himself with recording it in other cases. In view, however, of such passages as Acts xv. 6 (Jerusalem), xx. 17 (Ephesus), Titus i. 5 (Crete), S. James v. 14, 1 Pet. v. 1, we are justified in assuming the existence of *πρεσβύτεροι* everywhere as a permanent feature of ecclesiastical organisation, and Acts xx. 17 compared with ver. 28 ("he called to him the *elders* of the Church" . . . "the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *bishops*, *ἐπίσκοποι*), and Titus i. 5, 7 ("appoint *elders* in every city . . . if any man is blameless . . . for the *bishop*, *ἐπίσκοπος*, must be blameless"), enable us to identify the *πρεσβύτεροι* with the *ἐπίσκοποι*, whom we find mentioned, evidently as resident officers of the Church, in Phil. i. 1 and 1 Tim. iii. 1.¹

¹ There has recently been a tendency in some quarters to deny this identity, and maintain that the offices were distinct (So Réville, *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*), but on quite insufficient grounds. It has not been thought necessary to enter into the questions which have been raised of late years with regard to the origin of the name *ἐπίσκοπος*, and the original character of the office, because throughout this work *the genuineness of the whole of the New Testament is assumed*, and if we admit as genuine the First Epistle of S. Peter, and the Pastoral Epistles, together with the discourse to the Ephesian elders in Acts xx., it appears to me simply impossible to deny that (whatever may have suggested the *name*, which is really of a very general and indefinite character) the office was

With regard to the *first* order of the ministry, it is evident that a general superintendence of the affairs of the Church was exercised by the Apostles themselves. S. Paul "went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the Churches" (Acts xv. 41). The "apostles and elders" were gathered together to consider the question of circumcision (Acts xv. 6). Letters of apostolic counsel and direction are written by them with superior authority, and by their hands ministers are set apart. But as the years passed Churches multiplied, and the original company of the Apostles became fewer in number, it became necessary to make provision for the future. Consequently, towards the close of this period we meet with men like Timothy and Titus exercising apostolic powers, commissioned to take the general oversight of Churches, to "set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint elders in every city" (Titus i. 5; cf. 1 Tim. i. 3). These men are plainly superior to the ἐπίσκοποι or πρεσβύτεροι over whom they exercise authority, and they are empowered to ordain others, whereas we never read of any such power being given to the elders.¹ But it would seem to be inaccurate to speak of Timothy and Titus as bishops of Ephesus and Crete, for in each case the Apostle directs them to return to him when they have accomplished the work for which he left them in these places (see 2 Tim. iv. 9; Titus iii. 12, with which cf. 2 Tim. iv. 10, which shows that after Titus rejoined a spiritual one from the first. The use of the name in 1 Pet. ii. 25, as applied to Christ, "the shepherd and *bishop* of your souls," is surely decisive as to this. On the theories in question reference may be made to Gore, as above.

¹ It is instructive to compare the address to the Ephesian elders in Acts xx. with the apostolic charges to Timothy in the two Epistles addressed to him. While to Timothy is given the power to ordain others, together with instructions concerning the qualifications of those on whom he shall "lay hands," there is no indication in the address to the elders that any such power had been intrusted to them.

the Apostle, instead of returning to Crete he was sent elsewhere, to Dalmatia). All that can be claimed for them is a “*moveable* Episcopate”;¹ nor need we at this early period expect to find more. Time was required for the full ecclesiastical system to grow up into its present form; and the *diocesan system*, with its territorial bishops with definite regions assigned to each, was a later growth. In the period now under consideration we find no trace of it outside Jerusalem, where, as we have seen, it existed from the beginning. But the order of bishops as chief ministers of the Church may be distinctly traced to the Apostles. Men like Timothy and Titus form the link between the later regionary bishops and the Apostles themselves. It is probable also that with them we should include the “prophets” of the New Testament as exercising similar powers, for not only are they mentioned in various places as occupying positions of importance, and sometimes joined very closely with the Apostles (see Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11); but also in the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, while the *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι* are the two orders of resident ministers (exactly as in the New Testament), *ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφήται* appear as itinerant ministers, exercising a general superintendence, and superseding the local officers from time to time.

We may, then, sum up the results of our investigations so far. At the close of the second period two orders of resident ministers (*ἐπίσκοποι* or *πρεσβύτεροι* and *διάκονοι*) are found in fully organised Churches; and superior to them are Apostles and apostolic men, who visit their Churches from time to time, set in order things that are wanting, and appoint local officers as they are needed. But so far the precedent set at

¹ The phrase is due to Bishop Lightfoot.

Jerusalem has not been followed elsewhere, and beyond this Church the diocesan system is not yet in existence.

(iii.) The third period lasts from the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) to the close of the century and the death of the last surviving Apostle, S. John (A.D. 100). For this period our authorities are much less full than for the period immediately preceding it. But sufficient remains to enable us without any hesitation to assign to this time the change from the general to the local ministry, with the introduction of an approximation to the diocesan system, if not everywhere, at least in some of the Gentile Churches; and since the change falls in the lifetime of S. John, there can be no doubt that it was made under his guiding influence. The proof that the change was made during these years may be put in this way. We have seen that in A.D. 70 there was no such thing as the diocesan system except in Jerusalem. At the beginning of the second century we find from the Epistles of Ignatius that this system is *already in existence*, and firmly planted in the Churches to which he writes.¹ This necessarily throws back its origination to the first century, and to the period subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem in 70. There are other slight indications which confirm this, and show us the change in progress.²

¹ Nothing can be stronger than the language of Ignatius on the position of the bishop as superior to the presbyters, and the necessity of doing nothing without him. There is scarcely one of his Epistles in which this is not insisted on. See *Eph.* i. ii. iv.; *Magn.* ii. iii. iv. vi. vii. xiii.; *Trall.* i. ii. iii. vii.; *Philad.* i. iii. iv. vii. viii.; *Smyrn.* viii. ix.

² No reference is made in the text to the "angels" of the seven Churches of Asia (Rev. i.-iii.), because of the uncertainty which there is concerning the meaning of the term. If the *early* date of the Apocalypse be accepted, it is scarcely possible to identify the "angels" with the "bishops." If, however, the later date be adopted, the objection against the identification falls to the ground. Cf. Lightfoot *On Philippi*. p. 197.

(a) The *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, which has been previously referred to, may perhaps belong to the early part of this period.¹ As has been already mentioned, it bears witness to the existence of the earlier state of things with two orders of resident ministers, *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι*, and superior to them the *ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται*.²

(b) The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians was written about the year 96. It contains an important passage on the Christian ministry, c. xl.-xliv. The passage requires to be quoted at some length. Clement starts by saying that "we ought to do all things in order, as many as the Master hath commanded us to perform at their appointed seasons. Now the offerings and ministrations He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. And where and by whom He would have them performed He Himself fixed by His supreme will: that all things being done with piety according to His good pleasure, might be acceptable to His will. They, therefore, that make their offerings at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed: for while they follow the institutions of the Master they cannot go wrong. For unto the high priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their proper office is appointed, and upon the Levites their proper ministrations are laid. The layman is bound by the layman's ordinance."³ It would be impossible to state the general principle of ecclesiastical order more strongly

¹ The exact date is quite uncertain, but it would probably be correct to place it sometime between 70 and 120.

² See c. xi. xiii. xv., and cf. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 276 *seq.*

³ C. xl. The translation is Bishop Lightfoot's, *Apost. Fathers*, Part I. vol. ii. p. 292. The original Greek may be seen on p. 121.

than is here done by Clement; and even if (with Bishop Lightfoot¹) we decline to press the analogy of the *threefold* ministry, yet still it remains true that a general comparison of the Christian ministry with that of the Jews is made, and that Clement regards the ministry as a necessary and Divine institution. Further, in the following passage, a portion of which has been already quoted under Article XXIII.,² he proceeds to state with equal clearness the principle of the succession: "The Apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both, therefore, came of the will of God in the appointed order. Having, therefore, received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their first-fruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe.³ . . . And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause, therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance,⁴ that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministrations. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men of repute with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ . . . these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 123.

² See above, p. 578.

³ C. xlii.

⁴ Ἐπιμονήν, see the note on p. 578.

from their ministrations. For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblameably and holily. Blessed are those presbyters who have gone before," etc.¹

These words need but little by way of comment, since they clearly insist on the importance of the succession with an appointment from the Apostles in the first instance, and afterwards from others *in accordance with their arrangement*. The only possible question is whether Clement recognises what is called monarchical episcopacy as existing at Corinth. His own position as "bishop" (in the modern sense) of the Church of Rome is thoroughly well established, but the passage just cited shows that ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι are with him still convertible terms, and there is no reference in his Epistle to any one person as ruling over the Church of Corinth above the presbyters. It is possible, then, that the local and diocesan system had not as yet been adopted at Corinth.² But on the principles of ecclesiastical order, and the need of a valid commission and succession, S. Clement's evidence is perfectly clear.

(c) To a later date belongs S. Clement of Alexandria's treatise, *Quis Dives Salvetur* (c. 180). But it may here be mentioned, because the narrative contained in it concerning S. John and the robber bears such manifest tokens of reflecting the genuine state of things in the apostolic days. In it ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος are still convertible terms; but the position of the bishop as presiding over the Church seems to be implied; and, moreover, the organisation of the Churches is expressly attributed to S. John, who is said to have come from Patmos to Ephesus, and to have gone also "when called, to the neighbouring regions of the Gentiles; in some to

¹ C. xliv.

² Cf. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 322.

appoint bishops, in some to institute entire new Churches, in others to appoint to the ministry some one of those indicated by the Holy Ghost.”¹ This exactly fits in with what we find elsewhere; and taken together we may say that the *Διδαχὴ*, the Epistle of S. Clement of Rome, and the narrative preserved by Clement of Alexandria, give us glimpses of the change that was passing over the system of the Church during the last quarter of the first century,—the change, that is, whereby the chief pastor became permanently resident as the highest officer in each Church, and the name of bishop or *ἐπίσκοπος* was attached exclusively to him. The Epistles of Ignatius, as referred to above, show us the change complete: and there is no necessity to pursue the history further here.

Against the view which has here been taken, that to the Apostles and their successors alone belonged the right of ordaining others, transmitted by them to the *ἐπίσκοποι* of the later Church, two passages of Scripture have sometimes been urged.²

(i.) The incident in Acts xiii. 1–3, where Paul and Barnabas are “separated for the work” by some who were not Apostles. The answer to this is twofold: *first*, it may be urged that if this is to be regarded as their actual ordination, it is still not an instance of *Presbyterian* any more than of *Episcopal* ordination; for if bishops are not mentioned, no more are presbyters. Those who are spoken of are called “prophets and teachers,” and, as has already been shown, the position of the prophets seems

¹ Quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* III. xxiii.

² It seems unnecessary to refer further to the view sometimes urged, that as *ἐπίσκοποι* and *πρεσβύτεροι* are convertible terms in the New Testament, their subsequent distinction is an invention of a later date, for the facts already summarised go to show that the “bishops” of the second century and later are the successors of the Apostles and of men like Timothy, rather than of the New Testament *ἐπίσκοποι*.

to correspond more nearly with that of the later bishops than with that of the second order of the ministry. But, *secondly*, it is very doubtful whether it was an ordination at all. Indeed, the arguments against regarding it as one seem overwhelming. To begin with, both Paul and Barnabas are included among the "prophets and teachers," and Barnabas actually heads the list. Therefore, whatever ministerial authority those who laid their hands on them possessed, Paul and Barnabas already possessed the same. Moreover, S. Paul always claimed that his apostolic commission came to him direct from Christ Himself, and "not from men, neither through men" (Gal. i. 1); and though on this view there is no actual mention of the ordination of S. Barnabas, yet it is worthy of note that on a previous occasion he appears as the delegate and representative of the Church of Jerusalem, invested with powers which it may fairly be said presuppose a formal commission from the Church (see Acts xi. 22, *ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν*). It appears, then, to be practically certain that the incident narrated in Acts xiii. was no ordination, but only a setting apart of the two Apostles to the Gentiles for their special work, done according to ancient custom, with prayer and imposition of hands.

(ii.) It is said that Timothy is spoken of as having been ordained "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14). Yes; but if the text is referred to, it will be seen that the expression employed is this, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy (*διὰ προφητείας*), with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (*μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*). It came to him, then, primarily *through* (*διὰ*) prophecy, and only with the accompaniment of (*μετά*) the laying on of the hands of the presbyters present: and "prophecy," it must be

repeated, is closely connected with the Apostolate; besides which, in 2 Tim. i. 6 S. Paul speaks of the gift as being in Timothy “*through* the laying on” of his own hands (διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου). Clearly, therefore, he himself took the chief part in the ordination of his disciple, and the presbyters present were probably joined with him, as they are to this day when men are set apart for the priesthood.

We conclude, then, that the statement in the Preface to the Ordinal is strictly true, and that “from the Apostles’ times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons”; and thus the “Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons,” cannot be said to contain anything that is of itself superstitious or ungodly, because it recognises and retains the Episcopal order. Before passing on to the next objection, it may be well to add a few words concerning the mind of the Church of England on the *necessity* of Episcopacy. Certainly all that the actual terms of the Article now under consideration bind us to is this: that Episcopacy is not in itself superstitious or ungodly. This amounts to no more than saying that it is *an allowable form of Church government*, and leaves the question open whether it is the only one. This question is not decided for us elsewhere in the Articles; for even where we might have reasonably expected some light to be thrown upon it, we are met with a remarkable silence. Thus there is no mention of Episcopacy in the Article on the Church; and in that “*de vocatione ministrorum*,” as was pointed out in the remarks upon it, there is a singular vagueness in the description of those who “have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.” The Articles, then, leave us without any

real guidance on the question whether Episcopacy is to be regarded as *necessary*. Nor need we feel surprise at this, for at the time when they received their final form English Churchmen were standing on the defensive, and engaged in a severe struggle with a strong Presbyterian party, who objected to Episcopacy altogether. As against these men they were mainly concerned to defend the Episcopal form of Government as *allowable*, and with this they were content.¹ For the deliberate judgment of the Church of England we must look elsewhere. We find it in the Book of Common Prayer, which received its final form nearly a hundred years later than the Articles. The statements there made in the Preface to the Ordinal are conclusive as to the view taken by the Church. They may be summed up as follows:—

- (i.) The threefold ministry has been the rule of the Church from the Apostles' days; and no one has ever been allowed to exercise that ministry without a proper commission from lawful authority.
- (ii.) It is to be continued in the Church of England.
- (iii.) And therein no one is to be accounted a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, without Episcopal ordination.

The formal and deliberate assertion of this last fact dates from the final revision of 1662. The other two statements come down to us from the first Prayer Book

¹ It is possible to see indications of a change of view in Hooker. In Book III., though he maintains that government by bishops "best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture" (xi. § 16), yet he does not press for it as necessary. In Book VII. c. xiv., a much stronger position appears to be maintained by him. A strong position is also taken up in Bishop Bilson's *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, published in 1593; and Bishop Hall, in *Episcopacy by Divine Right* (1639), directly maintains that Episcopacy . . . is not only an holy and lawful, but a Divine institution, and therefore cannot be abdicated without a manifest violation of God's ordinance. *Works*, vol. ix. p. 160.

of Edward VI. (1549), and belong to a time when the question of Presbyterian orders had scarcely been seriously raised in this country. Had the question never been raised they might have been deemed sufficient. When, however, it had been raised, and attempts had been made by certain persons (as they were in Elizabeth's reign) to minister in the Church of England without an Episcopal commission, it was well that their right to do so should be more expressly denied, and this is what is done by the addition to the Preface of the words referred to above. Thus the Church of England, as judged by her formal documents, recognises none but Episcopal orders. But even so, it is interesting to notice how she treats the subject entirely from a practical point of view, pronouncing on it, not as an abstract theological question, but only as it concerns herself. She is not called upon to judge others. But her own position she is called upon to make clear: nor does she shrink from the responsibility. She sees that Episcopacy has been the Church's rule from the days of the Apostles. She in the providence of God has retained it, and it is her duty to hand it on without breach of continuity. It may be "charity to think well of our neighbours." It is certainly "good divinity to look well to ourselves";¹ and therefore she feels compelled to insist upon Episcopal ordination in every case, and can recognise no other.

(b) *The formula of Ordination.*—Besides objecting to Episcopacy in itself, the Puritans denounced as superstitious and ungodly the words used by the bishop in conferring the order of the priesthood: "Receive the Holy Ghost [for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of

¹ Archbishop Bramhall. So Thorndike "neither justifies nor condemns" the orders of the foreign Protestants. See Haddan's *Apostolical Succession*, p. 168 *seq.*

our hands].¹ Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The words appeared to them "ridiculous and blasphemous," and they maintained that the bishop might "as well say to the sea, when it rageth and swelleth, Peace, be quiet, as say, Receive," etc.² Their objections led Richard Hooker to consider the form very fully, and with his vindication of it we may well rest content. The main points in his defence of it are these: (1) The term "the Holy Ghost" is often used to signify the gifts of the Spirit as well as the Person of the Holy Ghost. (2) Authority and power for the ministry is a spiritual gift. (3) He, then, through whom the power is given may surely say, "Receive." (4) If our Lord, in ordaining, used the words (S. John xx. 22), why may not His ministers, seeing that the same power is now given? (5) The use of the words teaches and acts as a constant reminder that, "as disposers of God's mysteries, our words, judgments, acts, and deeds are not ours, but the Holy Ghost's."³

Of course, if it be held that no special spiritual power is given to Christ's ministers, and that they are not "sent" by Him, as He was "sent" by the Father, the words may well appear not only ridiculous, but blasphemous. But by those who hold that such powers have been granted for the benefit of the Church, and transmitted in the line of the regular ministry, no serious

¹ The words in brackets were only added in 1662. They were therefore, as a matter of fact, not before the Puritans of Elizabeth's reign.

² Admonition to Parliament, and "T.C." quoted in Hooker, V. lxxvii. 5.

³ Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, Bk. V. c. lxxvii.

difficulty can be raised concerning the use of this particular imperative form of words, although it cannot be considered as *essential*, since it is of comparatively late introduction into the Church, not being found in the older Pontificals and Ordination Services.¹

II. *The Objections of the Romanists.*

The Roman objections to the validity of Anglican orders have been singularly varied; those which at one time were most confidently relied on being at another quietly discarded in favour of fresh ones which a diligent search had been able to discover. They may be divided into two classes: (*a*) historical difficulties as to the succession; and (*b*) alleged insufficiency of the form, and lack of "intention." Apparently at the present time the tendency is to rely exclusively on the latter. But the former have been urged with such persistency that it is necessary to recapitulate them here, and give a brief outline of the answer returned to them.

(*a*) *Historical difficulties as to the succession.*—Shortly after the accession of Elizabeth, objections were taken by the Romanists to the *legal* status of the newly-consecrated bishops, partly in consequence of the fact that at Parker's consecration it had been found impossible to comply with the terms of an Act of Parliament of Henry VIII.'s reign, requiring a metropolitan to be consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops, or else by four bishops in the occupation of sees;² partly because the Act of Mary's reign which repealed the Prayer Book had mentioned

¹ See Martene, *De Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus*, vol. ii. p. 22; and cf. Maskea, *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. ii. p. 231 (ed. 2).

² 25 Henr. VIII. c. 20. See the account of Bonner's objections to Horn's jurisdiction in Strype, *Annals*, i. p. 377; and cf. Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 9.

the Ordinal separately, whereas Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which brought back the legal use of the Prayer Book, had not done so.¹ All such objections were, however, disposed of by Act of Parliament in 1566,²—an Act which is only referred to here because it has sometimes been alleged as if it involved a practical confession of the invalidity of our orders. More serious are the allegations subsequently raised, that the succession of bishops really failed at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign. Shortly after her accession no fewer than ten of the twenty-seven sees were vacant by death, including Canterbury, and as fifteen bishops had been deprived, it is natural that this should appear the weakest point in the chain of our succession. Accordingly Roman controversialists have strained their energies to the utmost to prove that the chain was broken, and that Parker, through whom the great majority of subsequent English bishops have derived their orders,³ was never validly consecrated. It is, however, a very remarkable fact that no such objection was ever heard of during his lifetime. The earliest rumour of it appears in 1604, forty-five years after Parker's consecration, and twenty-five after his death. In this year the notorious "Nag's Head fable" was set afloat by an exiled Roman priest named Holywood, who asserted that Parker had been "consecrated" by a mock ceremony at the Nag's Head tavern. The story is so palpably ridiculous, and its falsehood so glaring, that it is now almost universally discredited,⁴ and Romans themselves have been forced to

¹ Denny and Lacey, *ubi supra*.

² 8 Eliz. c. 1.

³ It must, however, be remembered that the Italian and Irish successions also met in Laud, and that, therefore, the validity of our orders is not really entirely dependent on the due consecration of Parker. See Denny and Lacey, p. 6, and Appendix I.

⁴ Denny and Lacey, however, give instances where the story has been treated as true by recent Roman Catholic controversialists, see p. 215.

admit that "it is so absurd on the face of it that it has led to the suspicion of Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican orders."¹ In refutation of it, it may be sufficient to point out the following facts:—

(1) According to the original author of the story, it merely rested on hearsay, for Holywood asserted in 1604 that he had *heard* it from one Neal, one of Bonner's chaplains, who had died in 1590.

(2) As Fuller quaintly puts it, "rich men do not steal." There was no possible reason for Parker to submit to such a ceremony. He was a man with a clear head, well aware of the difficulties of his position, and no possible motive can be suggested why he should have consented to be a party to such a transaction.

(3) There is abundant contemporary evidence of his consecration in due form in diocesan registers, in contemporary letters, in Machyn's Diary, in the diary of Parker himself, and in a MS. memorandum in the handwriting of his own son.

(4) The official records in the Registry of Canterbury, and MSS. given by Parker himself to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, attest his consecration in due form at Lambeth (December 17, 1559) by Barlow (previously Bishop of Bath and Wells, and at that time elect to Chichester), assisted by Scory (late of Chichester), Coverdale (late of Exeter), and Hodgkins (suffragan of Bedford).²

The lie, for it is nothing else, concerning the mock ceremony at the Nag's Head was nailed to the counter when it first appeared, and, finding that it was hopelessly

¹ Estcourt, *The Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed*, p. 154.

² For the full refutation of the story reference may be made to Lingard, vol. vi. note DD; Haddan's *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England*, p. 180 *seq.*; and Denny and Lacey, p. 211 *seq.*

discredited, Roman Catholic controversialists very soon changed their ground, and in 1616 impugned the validity of Parker's consecration by raising the question whether Barlow, the principal consecrator, had ever been himself consecrated. The facts with regard to Barlow are these. He was nominated first to the see of S. Asaph in Henry VIII.'s reign as early as 1536. In the same year to S. David's. In 1547 he was translated to Bath and Wells. In Mary's reign he was deprived, and at Elizabeth's accession appointed to Chichester. There are several documents which speak of his "election" and "confirmation." But the registers make no mention of his consecration; and consequently it has been asserted that Barlow, whose views of the Episcopal office were certainly somewhat lax, had never submitted to it, and therefore was never really a bishop at all. Now, it must be noticed that even if Barlow had never been really consecrated, it would not affect the validity of Parker's consecration, and therefore of orders derived through him, because we are expressly told that all the four bishops said the words of consecration and laid their hands on Parker's head.¹ But, as a matter of fact, there is really no sort of reason for questioning Barlow's due consecration. Once more a bare summary of the argument is all that can here be given.

(1) The registrar during Cranmer's Episcopate has omitted *eight* other consecrations (which have never been doubted) out of a total of forty-five; and the records of consecrations have been omitted or lost in other Archiepiscopates as well, in particular in Warham's just before, and Pole's just after Cranmer's. These facts show that the registers were very carelessly kept, and that therefore no stress can be laid on the absence of the registration in Barlow's case.

¹ Cf. Brightman in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, vol. i. p. 171.

(2) By law, consecration was to follow confirmation within twenty days, under penalty of *præmunire*. For what possible reason could Barlow have subjected himself to the risk of incurring such a penalty?

(3) There is abundant evidence that he was regarded as a bishop by his contemporaries; even Gardiner styles him "bishop," and his "brother of S. David's."

(4) He acted in various ways which of necessity presuppose consecration, *e.g.* he sat in the House of Lords and the Upper House of Convocation, assisted at the consecration of other bishops, and *administered his diocese for years without a single person demurring to his jurisdiction.*

(5) Not the smallest doubt was thrown upon his consecration until forty-eight years after his death (1616), when the Nag's Head fable had broken down.¹

These are the only instances in which it has been possible for the most vigilant eyes to detect any possibility of doubting the succession of Anglican orders; and the attack seems only to have brought out the strength of our case. In the latest Roman Catholic utterance this seems tacitly admitted, for all such objections, which for more than two centuries and a half had been so persistently urged, are quietly ignored. Not a word is said of them in the Papal Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ* (1896); and we may therefore hope that we have heard the last of them. There remains the second class of objections previously referred, on which the whole case against our orders appears to be based at present, *viz.*—

(*b*) Alleged insufficiency of form, and lack of "intention."

In regard to the "form" of ordination, the grounds of complaint have varied from time to time. At one time it was asserted that Anglican orders were invalid because

¹ See Denny and Lacey, p. 26 *seq.*

of the disuse of the ceremony of the *porrectio instrumentorum*, or delivery of the sacred vessels to all who are consecrated to the priesthood.¹ It is well known that Pope Eugenius IV., in his decree to the Armenians (1439), made the "form" of the Sacrament of Orders consist in this ceremony;² and if the Pope was right in this, there can be no question that not only Anglican orders are invalid, but also the orders of the whole Church, for it is absolutely certain that this ceremony did not exist till after many centuries of Christianity had elapsed. This is abundantly proved by Morinus, who shows that the ceremony is wanting in all the older ordination services of the Church;³ and consequently the objection at the present day takes a somewhat different shape. It is no longer said that the ceremony in itself is essential; but that the form is inadequate and insufficient because everything which implies the *sacerdotium*, and the power of offering sacrifice, has been eliminated from the rite. The special omissions which are said to establish this are two. *Firstly*, from 1550 up to the last revision of the Ordinal in 1662 there was no special mention in the formula of ordination of the office for which the aid of the Holy Ghost was sought. The form was simply this: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive," etc.; and for the consecration of a bishop: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by

¹ In the first reformed English Ordinal the ceremony was retained, though the words referring to the power of sacrificing were omitted. "The bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible in the one hand, *and the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand*, and say: Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacrament in this congregation." The words placed in italics were, however, entirely omitted in 1552.

² Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. ix. p. 434.

³ Morinus, *De Ordinatione*. Pars III. exercit. vii.; cf. Denny and Lacey, p. 107.

imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love, and of soberness." Not till 1662 were the words "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands," and the corresponding words in the consecration of a bishop, "for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee," etc., inserted. *Secondly*, when the English Ordinal was put forth in 1550, the words which definitely speak of the power of sacrificing were dropped: "Accipe potestatem offere sacrificium Deo tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis." It is said that these omissions involve an entire change in the whole conception of orders, and thus invalidate the form. In answer to this, it may be pointed out that the words omitted are confessedly of late introduction, and therefore cannot be regarded as essential.¹ What was done in 1550 was to *revert to a scriptural formula in each case*, and to say that to do this invalidates the form is to prove too much. In the case of priests, the form used is the very one used by our Lord Himself, and therefore must be sufficient to confer whatever powers were conferred by it in the first instance; and we ask to confer no more. In the case of bishops, the words of S. Paul referring to the consecration of Timothy (2 Tim. i. 7) are employed, and the whole context makes it perfectly clear that it is for the office and work of a bishop that the gift of the Holy Ghost is sought. Moreover, in this case the corresponding form in the Latin Pontifical is equally indeterminate, as there, too, there is no specific mention of the office and work of a bishop. Further, with regard to the omission of the words which confer the power of sacrificing, it must be remembered that the formula of ordination as used in the Church of England includes,

¹ See further, Denny and Lacey, p. 72 *seq.*

and has always included, a commission to minister the sacraments; and this must necessarily include a commission to "offer" the Eucharistic sacrifice, in whatever sense the Eucharist be a sacrifice. It has been truly said that "the sacrifice of the Eucharist is not something superadded to the sacrament. It cannot be more than is included in 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Whatever it is or is not, it cannot be more than is covered by 'the perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again.' In conferring the authority to celebrate the Eucharist, the Church cannot help conferring the power of sacrifice, even if she would."¹ But, as was shown under Article XXXI., there is not the slightest ground for thinking that the Church of England ever wished to deny the Eucharistic sacrifice when rightly understood. "The Sacrifices of Masses," as often taught in the sixteenth century, she was rightly concerned to deny. And in her desire to repudiate what was false and heretical, it may be that she went further than was necessary in omitting reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice. But this is the utmost that can be fairly said; and it is a simple matter of fact that the commission to offer the Eucharist must be included in the "authority . . . to minister the holy sacraments in the congregation," which is given to every Anglican priest at the time of his ordination.

There remains the objection that our orders are invalid through lack of "intention." It has been said that "the Church does not judge about the mind and intention in so far as it is by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally, she is bound to judge concerning it. When any one has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting or conferring the sacrament, he is considered by the

¹ Brightman in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, vol. i. p. 189.

very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed."¹ This utterance of the highest authority in the Roman Church relieves us from the necessity of considering the private opinions of Barlow or Cranmer, or any others. If the due form be rightly and seriously made use of, that is all that is required. A parody or unseemly jest would not be a valid sacrament, even if the proper matter and form of words were used, because the lack of intention would be "externally manifest"; but where the ceremony is performed *as a Church ceremony*, there the intention of the Church is present, even if the minister be himself heretical. As Hooker puts it: "Inasmuch as sacraments are actions religious and mystical, which nature they have not unless they proceed from a serious meaning, and what every man's private mind is, as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine; therefore in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth the work hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God."²

That then with which we are concerned is not the "private mind" of any of the Reformers, but the form of the rite as expressing the mind of the Church of England; and if it could be proved that the rite was changed "with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the sacrament,"³ then,

¹ The Papal Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*.

² Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V. c. lviii. 3.

³ The Papal Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*.

indeed, it might be fairly held that defect of intention was established. But, as a matter of fact, the Church of England has been particularly careful to express her intention, and to make it perfectly clear that it was no new rite which she introduced in the sixteenth century, but that *her intention was to continue the ancient orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, which had come to her from the days of the Apostles themselves*. In witness to this, appeal may be made to the Preface, which since 1550 has stood in the forefront of the Ordinal.¹ It is there stated that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons, which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto. And therefore, *to the intent these orders should be continued*, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present bishop, priest, nor deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following." It is hard to conceive what more could be asked for, since it would be difficult to frame words which should express with greater clearness that the intention of the Church was not to make a new ministry, but to continue that which already existed. But if further proof of the mind of the Church be demanded, it may be found not only in the form of

¹ A few verbal changes were introduced in 1662, as may be seen by comparing the Preface as it stands in a modern Prayer Book with the form here given in the text.

service used which throughout speaks of "priests" and "bishops," but also in the fact that the Church of England recognises the priesthood of the Church of Rome; and while she takes the utmost care to guard her altars from unauthorised ministrations, yet whenever a Roman priest joins the Anglican Communion, he is recognised as a priest at once, and is in virtue of his ordination in the Church of Rome admitted to celebrate the sacraments. This could not be, unless the office were intended to be the same as that which he had already received. We conclude, then, that the objection on the score of *defect of intention* fails, as the other objections previously enumerated have failed; and that there is nothing to make us feel a shadow of doubt as to the validity of our orders, or as to the statement of the Article, that **the Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons . . . doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering . . . and therefore whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the rites of that book . . . all such [are] rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.**¹

¹ It has been impossible in the space available to give more than the briefest outline of the objections that have been raised against the validity of Anglican Orders, and of the answers returned to them. Fuller information must be sought in some of the many excellent treatises which exist upon the subject. Among older books, A. W. Haddan's *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England* may be mentioned; and reference should also be made to Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, which brings the subject fully up to date, and considers the objections in the latest form in which they have been presented. See also *The Bull Apostolicæ Curæ and the Edwardine Ordinal*, by F. W. Puller; and for the practice of the Roman Church as to the reordination in Mary's reign of those who had been ordained according to the Edwardian Ordinal, see W. H. Frere, *The Marian Reaction in its relation to the English Clergy*.

ARTICLE XXXVII

De civilibus Magistratibus.

Regia Majestas in hoc Angliæ regno ac cæteris ejus dominiis summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum hujus regni sive illi ecclesiastici sunt sive non, in omnibus causis suprema gubernatio pertinet, et nulli externæ jurisdictioni est subjecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiæ Majestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi: non damus Regibus nostris aut verbi Dei aut sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam Injunctiones ab Elizabetha Regina nostra nuper æditæ, assertissime testantur: sed eam tantum prærogativam, quam in sacris Scripturis a Deo ipso omnibus piis principibus, videmus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines fidei suæ a Deo commissos, sive illi ecclesiastici sint, sive civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio civili coerceant.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliæ.

Leges civiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia et gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet et ex mandato

Of the Civil Magistrates.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended: we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's words or of sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: But that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

The laws of the realm may

Magistratus arma portare et justa¹ punish Christian men with death,
bella administrare. for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at
the commandment of the Magis-
trate, to wear weapons and serve in
the wars.

VERY important alterations were made in this Article in 1563, when the first paragraph was entirely rewritten, and the second, referring to Elizabeth's Injunctions, introduced for the first time. Instead of the very careful and guarded statement of the Royal supremacy now contained in these two paragraphs, the Edwardian Article had bluntly stated that "the King of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland." It also contained a clause (omitted in 1563) after that referring to the Bishop of Rome, stating in Scriptural language that "the civil magistrate is ordained and allowed of God: wherefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience' sake" (cf. Rom. xiii. 1, 5).

The object of the Article is (1) to explain and justify the tenet of the Royal supremacy, (2) to assert formally the repudiation of the jurisdiction of the Pope, and (3) to condemn the attitude of the Anabaptists with regard to the obedience due to the magistrate, and the lawfulness of capital punishment and of serving in war. With regard to this last point it may be noted that so formidable was the spread of the Anabaptists, that they were expressly excluded from the pardon granted by Henry VIII. in 1540; and among their errors the following are particularly mentioned: "That it is not lawful for a Christian man to bear office or rule in the Common-

¹ It is not easy to say why there is nothing corresponding to this word in the English. In the series of 1553 "justa bella" was represented by "lawful wars."

wealth,"¹ and "that no man's laws ought to be obeyed."²

The subjects brought before us in this Article may best be treated of under the following heads:—

1. The Royal supremacy.
2. The Papal claims.
3. The lawfulness of capital punishment.
4. The lawfulness of war.

I. *The Royal Supremacy.*

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

¹ Cf. the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, *De Hæres.* c. 13.

² 32 Henr. VIII. c. 49, § 11. See Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. iii. p. 843, and cf. the Confession of Augsburg, Art. XVI.: "*De rebus civilibus.* De rebus civilibus docent, quod legitimæ ordinationes civiles sint bona opera Dei, quod Christianis liceat gerere magistratus, exercere judicia, judicare res ex imperatoriis, et aliis præsentibus legibus, supplicia jure constituere, jure bellare, militare, lege contrahere, tenere proprium, jusjurandum postulantis magistratibus dare, ducere uxorem, nubere. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui interdiciunt hæc civilia officia Christianis," etc. To the same effect, the twelfth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538: "Licet insuper Christianis universis ut singuli quique pro suo gradu ac conditione juxta divinas ac principum leges et honestas singularum regionum consuetudines, talia munia atque officia obeant et exerceant, quibus mortalis hæc vita vel indiget, vel ornatur, vel conservatur. Nempe ut victum quærant ex honestis artibus, negociantur, faciant contractus, possideant proprium, res suas jure postulent, militent, copulentur legitimo matrimonio, præsent jusjurandum et hujusmodi"; and in Hermann's Consultation, among the errors of the Anabaptists the following is noted: "That to administre the cōmon weale, to exercise cōmon ingementes, to punishe yll doers, be offices and workes contrarie to the preceptes of Christe, whiche a Christian man ought not to do."—English translation (1548), fol. cxl.

In considering the history of the formal assertion of the Royal supremacy, it will be well to mark out clearly two stages—(a) the recognition of the Sovereign as “Supreme Head,” and (b) his recognition as “Supreme Governor.”

(a) The formal recognition of the Sovereign as “Supreme Head” begins in the year 1531. In this year Henry VIII., who was now bent upon obtaining his divorce, with a view to obtaining the ready submission of the clergy when the question should be brought before them, insisted on the introduction of a new form of the king’s title into the preamble of an Act of Convocation by which a grant of money was to be made to the Crown. As originally presented to the Convocation, the form of the title spoke of “the English Church and clergy, of which the king alone is protector and supreme head.” It was, however, only accepted by the clergy with the qualifying clause, “as far as the law of Christ permits.”¹

The following year was marked by the “submission of the clergy,” whereby the Convocation formally acknowledged that the Royal licence was necessary for Convocation to meet, and to make Canons, and also agreed that the existing Canon Law should be reviewed by a Commission appointed by the Crown.²

Meanwhile Parliament had begun to pass a series of

¹ “Ecclesiæ, et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus.” For the history of this see Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. p. 62 *seq.* The text of this and the other formal Acts by which the Royal supremacy was recognised are conveniently collected together in the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, vol. i. p. 70.

² Dixon, vol. i. p. 110, *Ecc. Courts Commission*, p. 71. It was this agreement that the Canon Law should be reviewed which led to the appointment of the various Commissions from which the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* emanated. As, however, was mentioned in vol. i. p. 28, it never received any authority whatever.

Acts to restrain the Papal jurisdiction in this country, such as the Act for restraint of Appeals (1533), and thus to secure the supremacy of the Crown over all persons and causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil; and in 1534, not only was the submission of the clergy embodied in an Act of Parliament,¹ but an Act was passed asserting the supreme headship of the Crown, and defining its character.²

In this it was stated that, "albeit the king's majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognised by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations, yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirpate errors, heresies, and other enormities, and abuses heretofore used in the same: be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia, and shall have and enjoy annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm as well the title and stile thereof as all honours, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining; and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they may be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed,

¹ 25 Henr. VIII. c. 19.

² 26 Henr. VIII. c. 1. See *Ecl. Courts Commission*, p. 72.

repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm, any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."

The title "supreme head" was thus formally taken by Henry VIII. Its use was continued by Edward VI., and (at her accession) by Mary, who used it in the early proclamations of her reign.¹ She, however, is the last English sovereign who has ever claimed it. It was dropped by her on her marriage with Philip of Spain in 1554. The "Supreme Head Act," cited above, was legally repealed, *and has never been re-enacted*. But for twenty years, from 1534 to 1554, the "supreme headship" was a tremendous reality. It "involved a claim on the part of the Crown to exercise spiritual jurisdiction,² and not merely to see that the spiritual authorities exercised their jurisdiction, and was a wholly new and unprecedented claim." "For twenty years the independent jurisdiction of the Church, exercised by her own officers—the ordinaries—and in her own courts according to her own law, was superseded by the authority of the Crown, and the ordinaries became only the officers of the Government, in virtue of the powers said to be vested in the Crown by the recognition of its supreme headship."³

¹ Jewel makes good use of this fact as against the Romanists more than once. See his *Works* (Parker Society ed.), vol. i. p. 61, and iv. p. 974.

² Henry VIII. actually claimed to delegate the exercise of this spiritual jurisdiction to whomsoever he would, and in 1535 appointed Thomas Cromwell to be his vicegerent in ecclesiastical matters.

³ Wakeman, *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*, pp. 318, 320, where there is an admirable sketch of the whole subject.

The Church, it must be admitted, after her first protest, acquiesced in and submitted to this tyranny, and during this period many utterly irregular and unconstitutional things were done. Happily the period of the supreme headship was of no long duration, and there is no need to enter further into the history of it here.

(b) On the accession of Elizabeth in 1558, Mary's Act abolishing the old Act of Supremacy remained unrepealed; but a new Act was passed, claiming for the Crown the title of "supreme governor" instead of "supreme head."¹ And although the Act of Parliament conceded to the Crown large powers, and claimed for it, as Henry's Act did, spiritual jurisdiction, yet, when some of the clergy scrupled to take the oath enjoined by the Act, the sovereign put forth an explanation of it in "an Admonition to simple men deceived by malicious," which was appended to the Injunctions of 1559. This explanation is not altogether consistent with itself, for it claims the authority challenged and used by Henry VIII., but then proceeds at once to define and very materially limit its meaning, describing it as "of ancient time due to the Imperial Crown of this realm, that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." And it is added that "if any person, that hath conceived any other sense of the form of the said oath, shall accept the same oath with this interpretation, sense, or meaning; Her Majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of all manner of penalties contained in the

¹ Eliz. c. 1. See *Eccl. Courts Commission*, p. 73.

said Act against such as shall peremptorily or obstinately refuse to take the same oath.”¹

The explanation thus given is of the utmost importance. It forms an authoritative commentary upon and interpretation of the Act of Parliament, and, taken in connection with the alteration of style and the adoption of the title of “supreme governor” in place of that of “supreme head,”² it indicates a real and substantial change in the conception of the Royal supremacy. It reduces it within reasonable limits, and gives it a far more constitutional character, and one more in accordance with ancient precedents, than could be claimed for the form it had assumed under Henry VIII. Further, it should be noted that Elizabeth’s acts entirely bore out the interpretation which she gave in her Injunctions. Her *government* of the Church was a very real thing, but she was most careful to maintain that it is “the Church,” and not the Crown, which “hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and hath authority in controversies of faith;” and the powers which she claimed and exercised were visitorial and corrective, a right of supervision rather than of ordinary administration such as Henry VIII. and Edward VI. with his Council had exercised. It is, then, in this limited and qualified sense that the Royal supremacy was accepted by the Church at the accession of Elizabeth, and all subsequent documents that can claim to speak with any authority whatever upon the subject concur in regarding it in this light. Ignorant people have often spoken of the sovereign as “head” of the Church, but entirely without warrant.

¹ See Cardwell’s *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 232.

² “The Queen is unwilling to be addressed, either by word of mouth or in writing, as the head of the Church of England. For she seriously maintains that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being soever.”—Jewel to Bullinger, *Zurich Letters*, vol. i. p. 33.

“Concerning the title of ‘supreme head of the Church,’ we need not to search for Scripture to excuse it. For, first, we devised it not; secondly, we use it not; thirdly, our princes at this present claim it not.” So wrote Jewel in 1567,¹ and his words remain true still. The interpretation given in the Injunctions was expressly referred to in the Articles of 1563, so that, after claiming for the sovereign the chief *government* of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, the Article proceeds to explain with great care in what this consists.

Where we attribute to the Queen’s Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended: we give not to our princes the ministering either of God’s word or of sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: But that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

To the same effect in the proclamation issued on the occasion of the northern rebellion in 1569, Elizabeth expressly declared that she pretended “no right to define Articles of faith, to change ancient ceremonies formerly adopted by the Catholic and Apostolic Church, or to minister the word or the sacraments of God; but that she conceived it her duty to take care that all estates under her rule should live in the faith and obedience

¹ *Defence of the Apology, Works*, vol. iv. p. 974.

of the Christian religion; to see all laws ordained for that end duly observed; and to provide that the Church be governed and taught by archbishops, bishops, and ministers.”¹

Once more, in the “Royal Declaration” prefixed to the Articles in 1628, the sovereign is made to say that—

“Being at God’s ordinance, according to our just title, *Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church, within these our Dominions*, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge in unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this declaration following:

“That we are Supreme Governor of the Church of England: and that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the *Injunctions, Canons*, and other *Constitutions* whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their Convocations is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under our broad seal so to do: and we approving their said ordinances and constitutions, providing that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land.”

These documents are all-important ones, as showing how the supremacy was explained to and accepted by the Church. Something more, however, may here be added in justification of it.

The Article claims that it is only the “prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly

¹ Quoted in Hook’s *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. vi. p. 55.

princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself." This is the view of it which was strongly pressed in the sixteenth century, when an appeal was frequently made to the position occupied by the head of the State in the system of the Jews under the Old Covenant. So Jewel writes that "Queen Elizabeth doth as did Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Josias, Jehoshaphat."¹ But the position of the Jewish Commonwealth was so peculiar that it may be doubted whether the appeal was altogether a fair one, or whether the position of the sovereign is perfectly analogous to that occupied by the Hebrew monarchs. It is better to refer rather to those passages of the New Testament which support the claims of established authority to loyal obedience, as Rom. xiii. and 1 Pet. ii. 13-17. The Church, it must be remembered, exists as a spiritual society under the conditions of civil life. Its members must therefore be subject to the law of the State as to conduct and the enjoyment of the civil rights. Thus in very early days appeals were made even to heathen emperors by the Church where cases of property and civil rights were concerned.² And if Cranmer was right in asserting that no more is given to the sovereign by the assertion of the Royal supremacy than was conceded to Nero, who was "head" of the Church in S. Paul's day, or might be conceded to the Grand Turk, who in the same way is "head" of the Church in his dominions,³ certainly

¹ Jewel, *Works*, vol. iv. p. 1145.

² *E.g.* in the case of Paul of Samosata, who refused to give up the bishop's house after his deposition by the Council of Antioch in 269. After the defeat of Zenobia, the aid of Aurelian was invoked to give effect to the sentence of the Synod, and in 272, by the help of the civil power, Paul was ejected. See Eusebius, *H. E.* VII. xxx.

³ "Every king in his own realm and dominion is supreme head. . . . Nero was head of the Church, that is, in worldly respect of the temporal bodies of men, of whom the Church consisteth; for so he beheaded Peter

nothing more than a general reference to the language of the Apostles on the obedience due to constituted authority is required to justify it. It cannot, however, be seriously maintained that this is *all* that is intended by it. The conversion of the empire introduced a new state of things, and put the emperor into a new relation towards the Church. From this time forward a vague authority in the affairs of the Church was considered to be vested in him over and above his ordinary jurisdiction over all men. He was supposed to be in perfect harmony with the Church. His duty was to see its laws carried out; and to him it appertained to summon General Councils.¹ In later days, under the "Holy Roman Empire," the same thing is seen. It may be seen in the laws of Charles the Great, which "illustrate the action of a strong monarch. When a case could not be settled before the bishop or the metropolitan, he directed that it should be brought finally before himself. The Synods referred their decisions to him that they might be supplemented, amended, and confirmed. He claimed for himself the right and the duty of following the example of Josiah in endeavouring to bring back to God the kingdom committed to him, by visitation, correction, admonition, in virtue of his royal office."²

It is something of the same position and power which has been conceded to the sovereign in the Church of England; and the formal documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which claim it as the "*ancient jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical*,"³ are perfectly

and the Apostles. And the Turk, too, is head of the Church of Turkey."

—Examination at Oxford, 1555; *Remains*, p. 219.

¹ Cf. *Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, p. xv.

² *Ib.* p. xvi., where see references.

³ Canon 1 of 1604. In the third Canon it is maintained that the sovereign has "the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian emperors of the primitive Church."

justified in their claim. "The early English laws prove that similar powers [to those claimed by Charles the Great] were exerted by the sovereigns before the Conquest; and throughout the mediæval period the English king never surrendered his supreme visitatorial power, the power of determining finally, on his own responsibility and at his own discretion, the ecclesiastical relations of his subjects."¹ Or, as Mr. Wakeman puts it, "the constitutional character of the supremacy of the Crown . . . does not differ in principle from that exercised by William I. or Edward I., being in its essence the right of supervision over the administration of the Church, vested in the Crown as the champion of the Church, in order that the religious welfare of its subjects may be duly provided for."² Thus we maintain that, while its formal assertion in the sixteenth century grew out of the necessity for national resistance to foreign claims, yet the supremacy itself was no new thing. Questions of the utmost importance and delicacy may, of course, arise in connection with it; and in the present day, when the powers formerly exercised by the Crown have so largely passed from the personal control of the sovereign to the Parliament, a wholly new state of things has arisen. This has been greatly complicated by the unfortunate Act of 1833 (to say nothing of later legislation), which abolished the ancient Court of Delegates, in which the Crown appointed the members of the final Court of appeal in ecclesiastical causes, and transferred its powers to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But into the vexed question of the Ecclesiastical Courts there is no necessity to enter here. All that we are at present concerned with is this, viz. that since the Royal supremacy as explained to and accepted by the Church

¹ *Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, ubi supra.*

² *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*, p. 321.

is for all practical purposes identical with that anciently enjoyed by the Crown in this country, there is no sort of reason why its formal assertion in and since the sixteenth century should be thought to cause a difficulty to loyal Churchmen. The "supreme headship" is not claimed. The extraordinary powers exercised by Henry VIII. and Edward VI. are no longer in force. These the Church repudiates as arbitrary and unconstitutional. The supreme governorship, as defined and limited in the formal documents cited above, she loyally accepts.¹

II. *The Papal Claims.*

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

The statement of the Article sums up as briefly as possible the position taken up by the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It is, of course, well known that during the previous centuries, although a Papal jurisdiction was freely admitted, yet resistance to the claims of Rome was not infrequent, and various Acts were passed to limit the powers of the Pope in this country. But the summary rejection of Papal jurisdiction, as a whole, belongs to the sixteenth century. The account of the steps taken by the Church and State, including the formal declaration by Convocation in 1534, that "the Pope of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in holy Scripture, in this

¹ It has been impossible to do more than give the briefest outline in regard to the very important subject discussed in this section. Reference has been frequently made in the notes to the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, as well as to Mr. Wakeman's valuable note on the subject. To these the reader is referred for fuller details; and with them mention should be made of Mr. Gladstone's famous letter to Bishop Blomfield, "*The Royal Supremacy as it is defined by reason, history, and the Constitution.*"

kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop,"¹ belongs to the province of ecclesiastical history, and there is no need to summarise the details here. What is required is to show that the action of the Church of England can be justified, and that the statement of the Article is true. If it be a fact that our Lord conferred upon S. Peter a position and power superior to that of the other Apostles, and that this has been transmitted to his successors in the see of Rome, so that the Pope is by Divine appointment head of the universal Church, then clearly the Church of England was in the wrong in asserting her freedom from his jurisdiction. What is necessary for us here, then, is to consider (*a*) the Scriptural grounds on which the Papal claims are based, and (*b*) the evidence from the early Church concerning these claims; for if it can be established that no position of "supremacy" involving universal jurisdiction was granted by our Lord to S. Peter, and no such position conceded to the bishops of Rome in primitive times, then it would seem to follow that the assertion of the Papal claims in later days was an unwarrantable usurpation, and that the Church of England was perfectly justified in the formal repudiation of them which it made in the sixteenth century.²

(*a*) *The Scriptural grounds on which the Papal claims are based.*

Three passages of the New Testament are quoted by

¹ See Dixon's *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. pp. 227, 238.

² The decree of the Vatican Council (1870), "Pastor Æternus," is so drawn as really to put out of court any appeal to theories of "development" in connection with the Roman claims, for it boldly asserts that the tradition received *a fidei Christianæ exordio* attests (1) the right of the bishop of Rome to a universal jurisdiction, plenary, supreme, ordinary, and immediate; and (2) his infallibility when defining *ex cathedra* a doctrine on faith and conduct as to be held by the Church universal. Cf. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 2.

modern Papalists—(1) the promise to S. Peter in S. Matthew xvi.; (2) our Lord's words to him in S. Luke xxii. 32; and (3) the threefold commission in S. John xxi. Of these the first is far the most important.

“I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

In considering this passage, it should be noticed that the words concerning “binding” and “loosing,” here addressed to S. Peter, are afterwards spoken to the Apostles generally (c. xviii. 18). Consequently whatever power was conferred by them upon S. Peter was afterwards granted equally to the others. But the earlier part of the promise refers to S. Peter alone. Admitting, however, for the sake of argument that the “rock” is Peter himself, yet it still remains that the promise appears to be a strictly *personal* one. There is no indication whatever in it of any headship capable of transmission to a series of successors in his see. It is far more natural to take the words as referring by anticipation to the historical position taken by S. Peter in the foundation of the Church, and to see its fulfilment in the early chapters of the Acts, where S. Peter takes the lead throughout, but nowhere claims for himself any powers not enjoyed by the other Apostles, nor acts apart from them. In order to establish the Roman interpretation of the passage, which is certainly not suggested by its terms, it would be necessary to show that from the very first there had existed a strong tradition in the Church thus interpreting it, and referring to it as establishing the Papal claims to headship. *But*

*this is absolutely wanting.*¹ And if this passage breaks down it will scarcely be contended that anything can be proved in favour of the Papacy from S. Luke xxii. 32, or from S. John xxi. The former of these ("I have made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren") is apparently never applied in favour of the Papal claims before the seventh century;² and when the threefold denial of S. Peter is remembered, the threefold commission of S. John xxi. ("Feed My lambs . . . Feed My sheep . . . Feed My sheep") becomes at once his natural restoration to his office, and cannot be regarded as investing him with any position of superiority to the other Apostles.³ But if the appeal is made to Scripture, we must not be content with the consideration of these three passages alone. There are other passages besides these which really bear on the question of the Papal claims, for the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles show us the real position historically occupied by the Apostle, and make it clear it was very far from being one of "headship" in the sense of authority over the whole Church. Certainly in the early chapters of the Acts S. Peter takes the lead in action. But to take the lead in action is one thing; to claim to be supreme head is quite another. And against the notion that his position was one of such authority must be set such facts as these. His conduct is called in question by others, and he vindicates it before the Church (Acts xi. 1-4). S. Paul on one occasion does not hesitate to "resist him to the face, because he stood condemned" (Gal. ii. 11). He is "sent" together with John by the Apostles to Samaria

¹ See Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 327 *seq.*, where the passage is fully considered; and cf. Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 481 *seq.*

² Salmon, *op. cit.* p. 336.

³ *Ib.* p. 339.

(Acts viii. 14). At the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.) he is not even president: this position being occupied by S. James, who sums up the debate and gives his decision (*διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω*, ver. 19). This of itself seems conclusive, for it is inconceivable that if our Lord had invested S. Peter with any such authority as that now claimed by the Pope as his successor, any but he could have presided on such an occasion. We may, then, safely say that, while a primacy of repute and honour may be rightly conceded to S. Peter among the Twelve,¹ there is not a shred of evidence in the New Testament that he was ever more than *primus inter pares*, or that even this primacy was capable of being transmitted to others.²

(b) *The evidence of the early Church concerning the Papal claims.*—Let it be admitted that the evidence for S. Peter's visit to Rome, and for regarding him as co-founder with S. Paul of the Church there, is sufficient; and that the succession of bishops in that see may be traced back to him. Yet it does not follow that S. Peter was ever "bishop" of Rome in the modern sense, any more than S. Paul was "bishop" of the various Churches which he founded, or, indeed, of Rome itself. But even if his Episcopate could be proved, we should still be

¹ The position of S. Peter's name as standing *first* in all the lists of the Apostles given in the New Testament, together with the fact that in the list in the Gospel according to S. Matthew the word *πρῶτος* is attached to it (c. x. 2), would seem to point to something like a *primacy* belonging to him. But primacy is not supremacy.

² It must be remembered that we have S. Peter's own Epistles, as well as the accounts of his proceedings and speeches in the Acts; and it is a simple fact that nowhere does he give "the faintest hint of any consciousness of such office as Papalism assigns to him. This is not a mere argument *ex silentio*; if S. Peter had been, by Christ's commission, His unique Vicar, the monarch and oracle of the growing Church, a polity so simple and intelligible must have found expression in Apostolic writings, and could not have been ignored by the 'Vicar' himself."—Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 8.

justified in asking for evidence that subsequent bishops inherited from him a position of headship involving universal jurisdiction. And this is just what is not forthcoming. While in later times there is abundant evidence of lofty claims made by the Popes, and (sometimes) admitted by others, in the earlier centuries such language is markedly absent. Attention has recently been drawn to this part of our subject, and the question has been investigated afresh with the greatest care, with the result that it has been conclusively shown, in Dr. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, and in the Rev. F. W. Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, that during the early centuries nothing whatever was known of the claims made for the Papacy in later times. From the first the Roman Church was invested with a position of great importance in Christendom. Rome was the capital of the world. It was the meeting place for Christians of different nationalities. To it, as to a natural centre, men gravitated from all countries.¹ And thus its bishop came to occupy a position of ever-increasing importance. But history shows us quite clearly that in

¹ Something of this kind is evidently intended by Irenæus in the famous passage in his works (unfortunately only existing in the Latin translation). "Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorē (v.l. potiorē) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio" (III. iii.). Irenæus does not mean that every Church "must" as a matter of duty "agree with" the Roman Church on account of its "potentior principalitas"; but that the faithful from all parts "are sure to" (*necesse est*, it is a matter of course) "come together" there. "It is inevitable, S. Irenæus means, that Christians from all other parts of the empire should, from time to time, for various reasons, visit the Church in the great centre of the empire: this is a process which is always going on, which cannot but go on" (Bright, *Roman See*, p. 32). The "superior pre-eminence" belongs, it will be noticed, not to the *bishop*, but to the *Church*, or possibly to the *city*. See Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 375 seq. (c. xx.), and Puller's *Primitive Saints*, p. 31 seq., and cf. Bright, as above.

the second century it was the *Church*, not the *bishop*, to which a kind of primacy was given. The Papal theory inverts this, and makes the importance of the Church depend upon that of the bishop.¹ It is only towards the close of the second century that for the first time we meet with an attempt on the part of a bishop of Rome to assert his authority outside his own proper sphere.² This, however, altogether failed. The action of Victor in attempting to procure a general excommunication of the Quartodeciman Churches of Asia did not commend itself to the other bishops of the West, who (we are told) "rather sharply rebuked him,"³ an expression which could not by any possibility have been used by the historian had the notion of the Papal headship been then in existence.

In the third century the correspondence of S. Cyprian and the history of the controversies in which he was engaged afford us considerable insight into the position then occupied by the bishop of Rome. There is no question that S. Cyprian regarded the see of Rome as the symbol and centre of unity; but his actions,⁴ as well as his words,⁵ make it clear that in his view "the function

¹ The well-known decree of Constantinople (381), which raised the see of that city to the second place in Christendom "because it is the new Rome," shows very plainly the origin of the importance of the bishop of Rome. The canon was confirmed at Chalcedon (451), when it was laid down that the first place belonged to the see of Rome "because that is the imperial city." On the protests of the Roman legates, and the refusal of Leo I. to recognise this, see Salmon's *Infallibility*, p. 416.

² The account is given in Eusebius, V. xxiv. xxv.

³ Φέρονται δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν φωναί, πληκτικώτερον καθαπτομένων τοῦ Βικτορίου, Euseb. *l.c.*

⁴ Mention may be made of (1) his persistent opposition to the Roman view of the validity of heretical baptism, and (2) his attitude in regard to appeals, as shown in the case of the Spanish bishops, Basilides and Martial, where he set aside altogether the judgment of Pope Stephen, *Ep.* lxxvii.

⁵ For Cyprian's view of S. Peter's position reference should be made to *Epp.* xxxiii., xlv. 1, xlviii. 3, lix. 14, lxx. 3, lxxiii. 7; and *De*

of the Roman see in relation to unity was ideal and typical; it carried with it no jurisdiction, no right to dictate."¹

During the early years of the fourth century the history of the Donatist schism supplies an incidental witness that Rome was not the final authority, for, after the question had been referred by the emperor to Melchiades, bishop of Rome, with a few others, the decision of the Council held by him was reviewed by a larger Council held at Arles, in order that a more authoritative settlement of the question might be arrived at.²

Not until we come to the Council of Sardica, in 343, do we find any *legal* rights beyond those of other bishops granted to the bishops of Rome; and even then the right of hearing appeals in certain cases was a strictly limited one, and was granted by the Council as a new thing, as a matter of ecclesiastical order, and not based on any Divine right or inherent authority of the see of Rome.³ In after years the canon was frequently, though wrongly, appealed to as "Nicene,"⁴ and the confusion was undoubtedly advantageous to the interests of Rome. To this canon may be traced the *beginning* of whatever legal rights of jurisdiction over other Churches were afterwards acquired by the see of

Unit. iv. Cf. Bright's *Roman See*, p. 39 *seq.*; and for the famous interpolation in the last of these passages see *The Pope and the Council*, by "Janus," p. 127.

¹ Robertson in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, vol. ii. p. 230.

² "On papal principles [the Emperor] ought, of course, to have upheld, as by Divine right final, a judgment affirmed by the Roman see. But nothing of the kind occurred to him, or to any one else at the time." —Bright, p. 63, where see the whole account of the incident.

³ The canon in question (Canon iii.) may be seen in Hefele, *Councils*, vol. ii. p. 112; and on it see Bright, p. 85 *seq.*, and Puller, p. 148 *seq.*

⁴ They were so quoted by Zosimus in the case of Apiarius (Bright, p. 136), as also by Leo I. and others.

Rome. In earlier days, while there is ample evidence of the importance of the *Church*, and of the growing influence of the *bishop*, it is only moral influence, and not legal right of jurisdiction, that can be found. Into the history of the extension of the legal jurisdiction, and the growth of the temporal power (resting largely on forgeries¹), there is no necessity to enter here. In what has been already said it has been sufficiently indicated how there is a complete lack of evidence in the early centuries for the claims subsequently made, and how the power was a matter of gradual growth. The barest outline of the argument has been all that space permitted. Details must be sought in the able works referred to in the text and the footnotes.

III. *The Lawfulness of Capital Punishment.*

The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

This subject admits of the briefest treatment. No question can be raised as to the lawfulness of capital punishment under the Old Covenant. Not only was it expressly commanded in various cases under the Mosaic law: but even before the law was given, it was laid down by Divine command that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" (Gen. ix. 6). The New Testament nowhere contains an express reversal of this rule. Consequently it can scarcely be maintained that capital punishment is forbidden by the law of God: and no more than this is required. All that the Article asserts is that "the laws of the realm *may* punish Christian men with

¹ On the "false decretals" and the "donation of Constantine," see *The Pope and the Council*, pp. 94 and 131.

death" in certain cases. Into the question whether capital punishment is *advisable* or not there is no need to enter. That is a matter on which opinions may differ, and with which we are not here concerned, for subscription to this statement of the Article will remain unaffected, however it be decided.

IV. *The Lawfulness of War.*

It is lawful for Christian men, at the command of the Magistrate, to wear weapons and serve in the wars (*justa bella administrare*). Once more brevity must be studied, although the question now before us is involved in much greater perplexity than that which has just been considered. All that can here be said is this. Christianity accepted society and social institutions as it found them; but laid down principles which were intended gradually to alter and abolish what was wrong in them. So slavery was accepted by the gospel. There is not one word in the New Testament which directly condemns it. But the principle of brotherhood was proclaimed, and this has so wrought in the hearts of men that it has at length brought about the abolition of slavery in Christian communities. In the same way Christianity accepted war. Our Lord and His Apostles never urged soldiers to give up their calling.¹ But it is hard to resist the conclusion that the principles which are laid down in the gospel *ought*, if they had honestly been applied on a wide scale, to have led long ago to the disuse of war, at least between Christian nations. What is required is that the principles of Christianity should so leaven society that war should become an impossibility. But

¹ See also the directions of the Baptist to the "men on the march" who asked him what they should do, in S. Luke iii. 14.

until this happy result is brought about, in the face of the absence of any directions in the New Testament to soldiers requiring them to forsake their calling, it can scarcely be maintained that it is *not* "lawful for Christian men to wear weapons and serve in the wars." It may be added that the numerous allusions to the military life as affording instructive lessons and analogies to the life of the Christian, appears not only to be based on the supposition that the life thus referred to is in itself a lawful one, but also to indicate that it is especially favourable to the development of certain very essential moral qualities.¹

¹ Reference should be made to the masterly sermon on "War" in Mozley's *University Sermons*, No. V., as well as to the late Aubrey Moore's paper on the same subject in the *Report of the Portsmouth Church Congress*.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

De illicita bonorum Communica- tione.

Facultates et bona Christianorum non sunt communia quoad jus et possessionem, ut quidam Anabaptistæ falso jactant. Debet tamen quisque de his quæ possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benigne distribuere.

Of Christian Men's Goods which are not common.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

THERE has been no alteration whatever in this Article (except in the form of the title¹) since it was first drawn up in 1553. The error of the Anabaptists condemned in it is described more fully in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, from which we learn that the opinion of the community of goods was in some cases pushed to such an extent that it was made to include and justify a community of wives.²

¹ Christianorum bona non sunt communia. Christian men's goods are not common. 1553 and 1563.

² *De Hæres.* c. 14: "*De communitate bonorum et uxorum.* Excludatur etiam ab eisdem Anabaptistis inducta bonorum et possessionum communitas, quam tantopere urgent, ut nemini quicquam relinquunt proprium et suum. In quo mirabiliter loquuntur, cum furta prohiberi divina Scriptura cernant, et eleemosynas in utroque Testamento laudari videant, quas ex propriis facultatibus nostris elargimur; quorum sane neutrum consistere posset, nisi Christianis proprietas bonorum et possessionum suarum relinqueretur. Emergunt etiam ex Anabaptistarum lacunis quidam Nicolaitæ, inquinatissimi sane homines, qui feminarum, imo et uxorum disputant usum per omnes promiscue pervagari debere.

The two subjects of which the Article speaks are these—

1. The community of goods.
2. The duty of almsgiving.

I. The Community of Goods.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast.

The notion of the Anabaptists here condemned probably originated in a misunderstanding of S. Luke's words in the Acts of the Apostles. Two passages have often been cited in proof of the assertion that Communism proper was the system that originally prevailed in the Apostolic Church, and from them it has been concluded that the same system ought to be practised now, and that consequently the possession of private property by individuals is contrary to the spirit of Christianity.

The passages in question are the following:—

Acts ii. 44, 45: "All that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need."

C. iv. 32: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul; and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common" (*ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά*).

Quæ fœda illorum et conscclerata libido primum pietati contraria est et sacris literis, deinde cum universa civili honestate, et naturali illa incorruptaque in mentibus nostris accensa luce vehementur pugnat." Cf. also the quotations given above on p. 761; and see Hermann's *Consultation* (Eng. tr.), fol. cxl.

These passages, however, do not stand alone; and a careful consideration of the whole account given by S. Luke of the early Church in Jerusalem, shows conclusively that what he is here describing is not so much an institution as a temper and spirit. Most certainly the rights of private property were not superseded. Mary the mother of John Mark still retained her own house (Acts xii. 12); while the words of S. Peter to Ananias prove that no necessity was laid upon him to sell his property, "Whilst it remained, did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" Moreover, as will be shown below, there are various injunctions to liberality in almsgiving in the Apostolic Epistles which are incompatible with Communism, for where a strict system of this kind is practised, and the rights of property are superseded, personal almsgiving becomes an impossibility. There are no "rich" to be charged to be "ready to give and glad to distribute."

It may be added, that while there ~~there~~ is no trace elsewhere of any system of Communism adopted by the Church, yet expressions are used by later writers¹ which afford striking parallels to those employed by S. Luke, and show us that no violence is done to his words if they are understood of the eager, enthusiastic spirit of love which so prevailed among the early Christians as to lead them to regard whatever they possessed as at the disposal

¹ Thus in the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* we read: "If thou have in thine hands, thou shalt give for ransom of thy sins. Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou grudge when thou givest: for thou shalt know who is the recompenser of the reward. Thou shalt not turn aside from him that needeth, but *shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own*; for if ye are fellow-sharers in that which is imperishable, how much more in the things that are perishable," c. iv. Tertullian also writes as follows: "One in mind and soul, we do not hesitate to share our earthly goods with one another. *All things are common among us, but our wives*," Apol. xxxix.

of their brethren; and not of any formal or systematic plan of Communism.¹

II. *The Duty of Almsgiving.*

Every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

That almsgiving is a Christian duty scarcely needs formal proof. It is sufficient to refer to—

(1) Our Lord's words in the Sermon on the Mount, where He does not command it, but rather *takes for granted* that His followers will practise it, and gives directions concerning the manner of doing it, as He does also with regard to the two other duties of prayer and fasting (S. Matthew vi. 1 *seq.*; cf. also S. Luke xii. 33).

(2) The directions concerning it in the Apostolic Epistles,² *e.g.* "Charge them that are rich in this present world . . . that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the life which is life indeed," 1 Tim. vi. 17–19.

¹ On the position of some modern Communists, who affirm that Communism was the natural outcome of the Law of Equality implied in Christ's teaching, and maintain that "Jesus Christ Himself not only proclaimed, preached, and prescribed Communism as a consequence of fraternity, but practised it with His Apostles" (Cabet, *Voyage en Icarie*, p. 567); see Kaufmann's *Socialism and Communism*, c. i.; and on the relation between Religion and Socialism, see Flint's *Socialism*, c. xi.

² The Second Book of the Homilies contains a plain Homily on the subject of "almsdeeds and mercifulness towards the poor and needy," in which the Scriptural directions on the subject from the Old Testament (including the Apocrypha), as well as from the New, are collected together, p. 406 (S.P.C.K.).

"To do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," Heb. xiii. 16.

Cf. also Rom. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 2 Cor. ix. 7; 1 John iii. 17, etc.

ARTICLE XXXIX

De Jurejurando.

Quemadmodum juramentum vanum et temerarium a Domino nostro Jesu Christo et Apostolo ejus Jacobo Christianis hominibus indictum esse fatemur: ita Christianam religionem minime prohibere censemus, quia jubente Magistratu, in causa fidei et charitatis, jurare liceat, modo id fiat juxta Prophetæ doctrinam, in justitia, in judicio, et veritate.

Of a Christian Man's Oath.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle: so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

LIKE the one just considered, this Article, which has remained without change since 1553, is aimed against a tenet of the Anabaptists, which is also condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.

“Præterea nec juramentorum Anabaptistæ legitimum relinquunt usum, in quo contra Scripturarum sententiam et veteris Testamenti patrum exempla, Pauli etiam apostoli, imo Christi, imo Dei Patris procedunt; quorum juramenta sæpe sunt in sacris literis repetita,” etc.¹

There are two passages of the New Testament which have appeared to others besides the Anabaptists to forbid the taking of an oath in any case.² They are (a) our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, and (b) the very similar words of S. James.

¹ *De Hæres.* c. 15. *De juramentis et participatione dominicæ Cœnæ*, and cf. the quotations given above under Art. XXXVII. p. 761.

² Not only the Quakers of later days, but some among the Christian Fathers took this view.

(a) S. Matt. v. 33–37: “Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of His feet; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one.”

(b) S. James v. 12: “Above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay (*or*, ‘let yours be the yea, yea, and the nay, nay,’ R.V. *marg.*); that ye fall not under judgment.”

These are evidently the passages to which the Article alludes, when it says that **we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle.** And it is tolerably clear that in neither passage is the formal tendering of oaths in a law court under consideration. Such a solemn act is referred to in the Epistle to the Hebrews in terms which conclusively indicate that the writer of the Epistle saw nothing wrong in it. “Men swear by the greater: and in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation” (Heb. vi. 16). So S. Paul, several times in the course of his Epistles, makes a solemn appeal to God, which is a form of oath (2 Cor. i. 23, xi. 10, 31, xii. 19; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8), and in one instance uses the expression *νῆ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν*, 1 Cor. xv. 31. And there are references to God as swearing by Himself, which it would be difficult to reconcile with the idea that there is anything essentially wrong in a solemn asseveration or oath, in order to gain credence for a statement (Heb. iii. 11, vi. 16, 17). But,

further, what seems quite decisive is the fact that when our Lord was solemnly adjured by the high priest, *i.e.* put on His oath, He did not refuse to answer. See S. Matt. xxvi. 62-64, "And the high priest stood up, and said unto Him, Answerest Thou nothing? What is it which these witness against Thee? But Jesus held His peace. And the high priest said unto Him, I adjure Thee by the living God (*ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος*) that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God? Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." In this case, as in others, our Lord's actions form the best commentary upon the meaning of His words, and prove decisively that the reference in the Sermon on the Mount is, as the Article takes it, to "vain and rash swearing." S. James' words are apparently directly founded on our Lord's,¹ and there is nothing in them to lead us to think that he is contemplating anything more than ordinary conversation and the use of oaths in it. We conclude, therefore, that there is nothing in Holy Scripture which need raise any scruple in the minds of Christians as to the lawfulness of acquiescing when solemnly put upon their oath. Whether the use of oaths by the Legislature is advisable is another matter, on which we are not called upon to offer an opinion. A man may regret the custom, and feel that it brings with it grave dangers of the profanation of sacred things, and encourages the false idea of a double standard of truthfulness, and yet hold that **Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to**

¹ This is made very plain if the marginal rendering of the Revised Version be adopted.

the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth. The "prophet," whose "teaching" is here referred to, is the prophet Jeremiah, who says (iv. 2), "Thou shalt swear, As the Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness";¹ and if judicial oaths are permissible at all, it can only be on these conditions.

¹ "Et jurabis: Vivit Dominus in veritate, et in iudicio, et in iustitia" (Vulgate). The passage is quoted in the Homily "Against Swearing and Perjury" (p. 73, S.P.C.K.), where the whole question of the lawfulness of oaths is also argued.

INDEX

- AACHEN, Council of, 222.
 Abbot, Archbishop, 48.
 Abelard, 111.
 Addis and Arnold, 472, 553, 659.
 Admonition to Parliament, 53, 458, 747.
 Adoration, Eucharistic, 667.
 A Lasco, John, 28, 643.
 Albertus Magnus, 149, 435, 692.
 Alexander, Archbishop, 591.
 Alexander of Hales, 435.
 Alexandria, Church of, 507.
 Alexandria, Council of, 109.
 Alley, Bishop, on the descent into hell, 160; on the Old Testament, 281.
 Almsgiving, teaching of Scripture on, 786.
 Ambrose, 219, 314, 360, 426.
 Amphilochius, 249, 265.
 Anabaptists, 22, 24, 125, 282, 358, 386, 398, 441, 455, 574, 588, 616, 760, 783, 788.
 Ancyra, Council of, 700, 711.
 Andrewes, Bishop, 47, 554, 660, 663.
 Anselm, 155, 701.
 Antioch, Church of, 507; Council of, 769.
 Apiarius, the case of, 779.
 Apocrypha, 274; Jerome on, 276; Hooker on, 278.
 Apollinaris, heresy of, 135.
 Apostles' Creed, history of, 305; origin of name, 313; text of, 315.
 Apostolical succession, 577, 740.
 Apostolicæ Curæ, the Papal Bull, 752.
 Aquinas, 171, 406, 435, 560, 598, 609, 670, 678.
 Aristides, 140, 299.
 Arminianism, 470.
 Arnold, T., 490.
 Artemon, heresy of, 105.
 Arundel, Archbishop, Constitutions of, 561.
 Ascension of Christ, 189.
 Assembly of Divines, 370, 376.
 Athanasian Creed, not the work of Athanasius, 329; a Latin Creed, 329; origin of name, 330; controversy on date, 331; internal evidence of date, 332; external evidence, 333; MSS. of, 336; contained in early collections of canons, 338; commentaries on, 339; used by early writers, 340; probable date of, 343; use made of, by the Church of England, 344; contents of, 345; objections to, 346; mistranslations in, 347; text of, 353.
 Athanasius, use of *Hypostasis*, 107; on the *Monarchia*, 116; on *Homoousios*, 126; on Sabellianism, 206; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 242; on the Canon of Scripture, 256; on blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 446; on the powers of the Church, 521; on Councils, 534.
 Athenagoras, 105, 205.
 Atonement, doctrine of, 150; theories of, 154; reveals the Father's love, 154; a mystery, 157; complete and sufficient, 688. Cf. 439.
 Augsburg, Confession of. See *Confession*.
 Augustine, on the Trinity, 101, 111, 112; on eternal generation,

- 123; on the divinity of Christ, 129; on the descent into hell, 167, 171; on the presence of Christ as man, 196; on the Macedonians, 208; on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 219; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 242; on the Canon of Scripture, 250, 256; on the Creed, 300; coincidences with the Athanasian Creed, 332, 345; on original sin, 360, 371; on grace, 383; on justification, 393; on good works, 410; on works before justification, 423; on predestination, 478; on ceremonies, 517; on purgatory, 545; on miracles, 553; on invocation of saints, 566; on sacraments, 596; on the Eucharist, 671.
- Augustine of Canterbury, 518.
- Autun, Council of, 333.
- BANCROFT, Bishop, 482.
- Baptism, effect of, in removing original sin, 373; lay, 505; Zwinglian and Anabaptist teaching on, 621; teaching of the Church on, 623; blessings of, 623; relation to confirmation, 630; of infants, Scriptural arguments for, 635; patristic evidence for, 637. See also *Regeneration*.
- Barlow, Bishop, consecration of, 751.
- Barnabas, Epistle of, 270.
- Basil, 206, 565, 566.
- Baxter, R., 56.
- Bede, 171.
- Bellarmino, 549, 613.
- Bengel, 115, 147.
- Beringar, 650.
- Bigg, C., 108.
- Blackburne, Archdeacon, 63.
- Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 447.
- Bona, Cardinal, 677.
- Bonaventura, 435, 567.
- Boniface VIII., 432.
- Boxley, Rood of, 561.
- Braga, Council of, 713.
- Bramhall, Archbishop, 660, 746.
- Bright, W., 773, 776.
- Brightman, F. E., 694, 755.
- Browne, Bishop H., on the Articles, 144, 172, 242, 244, 330, 465, 607, 632, 660.
- Bull, Bishop, 365, 413, 416.
- Burke, Edmund, 63.
- Burnet, Bishop, 18, 47, 660.
- Butler, Bishop, on the Atonement, 157.
- CÆSAREA, Baptismal Creed of, 316.
- Cæsarius of Arles, 309, 342.
- Cajetan, Cardinal, 572.
- Calvin, 385, 446, 474, 590.
- Canon of Scripture, meaning of the term, 243; method of determining, 250; difference between England and Rome on, 252; evidence on which the Canon of the New Testament rests, 261.
- Capital punishment, 780.
- Carthage, Council of, 257, 699.
- Cassian, 304.
- Celibacy of the clergy, history of, 696.
- Ceremonial Law of Moses not binding on Christians, 294.
- Cerinthus, 711.
- Chalcedon, Council of, 533.
- Charisius of Philadelphia, 225.
- Charlemagne, 221, 313, 337.
- Charles the Bald, 337.
- Cheke, Sir J., 13, 19, 654.
- Chrysostom, 192, 214, 471.
- Church, use of the word in Scripture, 497; the visible, 498; invisible, meaning of phrase, 499; Scripture proof of visibility of, 500; notes of, 502; legislative power of, 514; judicial power of, 520; a witness and keeper of Scripture, 526; particular or national, 717.
- Church authority, in relation to private judgment, 525.
- Church, Dean, 371.
- Clarke, Dr. S., 111.
- Clement of Alexandria, 171, 248, 275, 366, 471, 544, 693, 741.
- Clement of Rome, 104, 205, 248, 270, 467, 578, 739.
- Clermont, Council of, 430, 678.
- Clovesho, Council of, 567.
- Communicatio idiomatum*, 138.
- Communion of Saints, 311.
- Community of goods, 784.
- Concomitance, doctrine of, 683.

- Concupiscence, 375, 377.
Confessio Basiliensis, 9.
Confessio Belgica, 10.
Confessio Gallicana, 10, 376.
Confessio Helvetica, 10, 369.
 Confession of Augsburg, 8, 90, 120, 198, 232, 358, 388, 445, 493, 573, 587, 592, 616, 642, 680, 692, 761.
 Confession of Württemberg, 9, 120, 198, 232, 378, 388, 410, 513, 587.
 Confirmation, 604, 630.
 Constance, Council of, 431, 679.
 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 559.
 Constantinople, first Council of, 215, 533; second Council of, 533; third Council of, 533; seventh Council of, 559; eighth Council of, 559.
 Constantinople, Creed of, 324.
 Convocation, were the Forty-Two Articles submitted to it? 15.
Corpus Christi, Festival of, 666.
 Cosin, Bishop, 49.
 Councils. See *General Councils*.
 Counsels and precepts, 437.
 Cranmer, Archbishop, prepares the Forty-Two Articles, 12; his accounts of the title to them, 17; on the Eucharist, 642-674; his marriage, 702; on the Royal Supremacy, 769. See also 5, 7, 28, 258.
 Creeds, origin of, 297; indications of, in New Testament, 297; early forms of, 298; interrogative forms of, 300; introduced into the liturgy, 300; used as tests of orthodoxy, 301; difference between Eastern and Western, 302.
 Creighton, Bishop, 435, 556.
 Cup, denial of, to the laity, 506; condemned by early writers, 677; gradual growth of the practice, 679; rejected by the Church of England, 680; grounds of the rejection, 681.
 Curteis, Canon, 68.
 Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 105, 307, 360, 427, 453, 555, 595, 639, 711, 778.
 Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon, 309.
 Cyril of Alexandria, 216.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, catechetical lectures of, 207, 300; on the Canon, 255, 265; on the term Apocryphal, 276; creed of, 321; on the administration of the Eucharist, 677.
 Cyril Lucar, Confession of, 259.
 DALE, R. W., 147, 148.
 Decentius of Eugubium, 606.
 Deity, properties of, 139.
 Denebert, Bishop, 341.
 Denny and Lacey, 749.
 Descent into hell, change in the Article on, 160. See also *Hell, descent into*.
 Diaconate, origin of, 733.
Diatessaron of Tatian, 269.
 Diocesan System, origin of, 738.
 Diogenes of Cyzicus, 322.
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 107.
 Dionysius of Rome, 107.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, 597.
 Divinity of the Son, proved from Scripture, 127; of the Spirit, 199.
 Dixon, Canon R. W., 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 17, 29, 561.
 Docetism, 145.
 Donatism, 779.
 Double procession, the doctrine of, 211; objections to, 224.
 Driver, Dr., 164, 286, 291, 292.
 ELECTION, 466 *seq.*
 Elvira, Council of, 558, 698.
 Enoch, Book of, 164, 287.
 Ephesus, seventh canon of the Council of, 225; ratifies the Creed of Nicæa, 324. Cf. 530, 523.
 Ephraem the Syrian, 565.
 Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, on Montanism, 205; creeds given by, 319. Cf. 208, 215, 324, 557.
 Episcopacy, history of, 731; how far necessary, 744.
 Episcopal succession, Church of England, Roman objections to, 748.
 Erasmus, 568.
 Estcourt, 750.
 Eternal generation of the Son, 123.
 Eucharist, changes in the Article on, 644; teaching on, 647; adoption of, 667; elevation of, 666; reservation of, 666.

- Eusebius of Cæsarea on the Canon of the New Testament, 266; on the Creed of Nicæa, 316.
 Eutyches, heresy of, 186.
 Excommunication, Jewish, 706; Christian, 707; Scriptural grounds of, 708; history of, 710; canons concerning, 713.
 Extreme Unction, 605.
- FAITH, use of the word in Scripture, 399; why the instrument of justification, 404. See also *Justification*.
- Fall, the, effect of, 367; Scripture proof of, 370.
 Farrar, Dean, 457.
Fides infirmis and formata, 406.
 Field, Dean, 570.
 Flesh and bones, meaning of the term, 188.
 Florence, Council of, 547, 598.
 Forbes, Bishop A., 481, 591.
 Forbes, Bishop W., 422, 568, 572.
Formula Concordiæ, 369.
 Fortunatus, commentary of, on the Athanasian Creed, 334.
 Forty-Two Articles, history of their preparation, 12; had they the authority of Convocation, 15; their substance and object, 20; not intended to be a permanent test, 25; their sources, 26; how far dependent on the Confession of Augsburg, 26; their test, 70.
 Francis a Sancta Clara, 440, 617.
 Frankfort, Council of, 222, 560.
 Freeman, Archdeacon, 203.
 Freeman, E. A., 701, 702.
 Freewill, teaching of the Article on, 379; Council of Trent on, 380.
 Fuller, Church History, 15, 750.
 Fust, Sir H. J., 728.
 Future life, doctrine of, in the Old Testament, 287.
- GALLICAN additions to the creed, 309.
 Gangra, Council of, 698.
 Gardiner, S. R., 48.
 Gascoigne, *Liber Veritatum*, 433, 702.
 Gelasius, 678.
 General Councils, may not be gathered together without the consent of princes, 532; may err, 534; have erred, 535; their authority, 536; recognised by the Church of England, 536.
Generaliter, meaning of the word, 486.
 Good works, 404; teaching of the Article on, 412; follow after justification, 413.
 Gore, C., 98, 103, 125, 130, 144, 473, 659, 732.
 Gottschale, 475.
 Goulbourn, Dean, 515, 527.
 Grace, teaching of the Articles on, 380; teaching of Scripture on, 382; teaching of the Prayer Book on, 382; preventing and co-operating, 382; *de congruo* and *de condigno*, 418.
 Gregory the Great, 518, 547.
 Gregory VII., 701.
 Gregory Nazianzen, 210, 256, 265, 565, 566.
 Gregory Nyssen, 565.
 Gregory of Bergamo, 597.
 Guest, Bishop, share in the preparation of the Articles, 30; suggests further changes, 45; on Article XVII., 487; on Article XXVIII., 646, 662; on Article XXIX., 45, 669.
- HADES, 163. See also *Hell*.
 Hadrian I., 221, 337.
 Hadrian II., 337.
 Haimo of Halberstadt, 650.
 Hall, Bishop, 745.
 Hamant, Matthew, 120, 490.
 Hampton Court Conference, 54, 482.
 Hardwick on the Articles, 19, 25, 31, 39, 46, 51, 281, 386, 417, 512, 717.
 Hatfield, Council of, 220.
 Hebrews, Epistle to, hard passages in, 449.
 Hefele, Bishop, 256, 258.
 Hell, meaning of the word, 163.
 Hell, descent into, Scriptural grounds of doctrine, 166; object of, 169; early belief in, 175; history of the Article of the Creed on, 177; criticism of Pearson on, 179.
 Hermann, Archbishop, consultation of, 398, 575, 589, 761.
 Hermas, 205, 270.
 Heurtley, Professor, 177, 310, 322.

- Heylin, 15.
 Hilary of Arles, 332.
 Hilary of Poitiers, 110, 218, 256.
 Hildebert of Tours, 684.
 Hincmar, 650.
 Hippolytus, 108.
 Holy Communion. See *Eucharist*.
 Holy Ghost, addition of Article on, 198; Divinity of, 199; distinct personality of, 201; history of the doctrine of, 204; procession of, 209; blasphemy against, 446 *seq.*
 Holy Scripture, changes in the Article on, 231; sufficient for salvation, 234; decree of the Council of Trent on, 235; the Fathers on, 242; the Canon of, 248.
 Holywood, 749.
 Homilies, History of, 723; authors of, 724, 726; nature of assent to, 726; on the doctrine of a future life, 293; on justification, 407; on the Church, 494; on Councils, 536; on adoration of images, 561; on invocation of saints, 568; on the sacraments, 592, 600; on almsgiving, 786; on oaths, 791.
Homousios, meaning of the term, 125; adopted at Nicæa, 125; objections to, 126.
 Hooker, R., *Ecclesiastical Polity* of, 47; on the Incarnation, 136, 143; on the *communicatio idiomatum*, 138; on the gift of unction, 142; on the presence of Christ as man, 194; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 251; on the Apocrypha, 278; on preaching, 503; on the Church of Rome, 509; on the authority of the Church, 520; on Baptism, 624; on the Eucharist, 659, 663; on ceremonies, 720; on the ministry, 745; on the formula of ordination, 747; on intention, 756.
 Hooper, Bishop, on the Articles, 13; on the Anabaptists, 22, 145, 441, 486, 490; on the descent into hell, 162; on the Church, 499.
 Horsley, Bishop, 165, 173.
 Hort, F. J. A., on Genesis i.-iii., 363; on Article XIII., 422; on Article XXII., 553.
 Humanity of Christ, perfect, 141; sinless, 442.
 Humphrey, 41, 646.
 Hypostasis, history of the word, 107.
 Hypostatic union, the, 137.
 ICONOCLASTIC controversy, the, 558.
 Ignatius, 104, 140, 175, 205, 210, 270, 467, 738.
 Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, 103.
 Images, adoration of, 557 *seq.*
 Immaculate conception, the, 440.
 Imparted righteousness, 405.
 Incarnation, doctrine of, 137 *seq.*
 Indefective grace, 457.
 Indulgences, 426 *seq.*, 554 *seq.*
Inferi and *Inferna*, 163.
 Innocent I., 606, 701.
 Innocent III., 652.
 Institution of a Christian man, 5, 372, 508, 599, 609.
 Intention, doctrine of, 755 *seq.*
 Invocation of saints, the, 564 *seq.*
 Irenæus, 140, 153, 175, 241, 269, 275, 298, 303, 470, 557, 638, 777.
 Irresistible grace, 477.
 JAMES, on justification, 401; bishop of Jerusalem, 734.
 Jerome on the word *hypostasis*, 111; on the Apocrypha, 232, 256; on the term *Canonical*, 250, 275; on the Creed, 307, 314; on worship, 583.
 Jerusalem, Church of, 507.
 Jesus Christ. See *Son of God*.
 Jewel, Bishop, 44, 195, 764, 766, 769.
 John VIII., 430.
 Josephus, 253.
 Judgment, the last, 196.
 Julius, Pope, 534.
 Justification, use of the word in Scripture, 390; meaning of, 392; distinction from sanctification, 395; meritorious cause of, 397; instrument of, 398; by faith only, 400; works before, 415.
 Justin Martyr, 104, 140, 175, 204, 269, 271, 299, 470, 637, 677.
 KAYE, Bishop, 246, 470.
 Kirkpatrick, Professor, 289.

- Knox, A., 661.
Knox, John, 14, 730.
- LACEY. See *Denny*.
Lambeth Articles, the, 53, 457, 475.
Lanfranc, 701.
Laodicea, Council of, 256.
Laud, Archbishop, advises Charles I. to prefix declaration to the Articles, 49; on Canon V., 67; on Article XX., 513.
Leicester, Earl of, 64.
Leo I., 677.
Leo III., 223.
Leo the Armenian, 559.
Liberius, Pope, 526.
Liddon, H. P., 113, 117, 123, 125, 130, 144, 480.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 270, 327, 400, 551, 733.
Locus penitentie, 452; *venie*, 454.
Logos, doctrine of the, 122.
Lord's Supper. See *Eucharist*.
Luckock, Dean, 565.
Lumby, J. R., 335.
Luther on the Canon of the New Testament, 272; on the slavery of the will, 385; on justification by faith, 401; on good works, 411; on predestination, 484; on the effect of sacraments, 591.
- MACEDONIUS, heresy of, 207.
Marcellus of Ancyra, heresy of, 321; creed of, 306.
Martensen, Bishop, 191.
Mason, A. J., 604.
Masses, the sacrifices of; meaning of the phrase, 691; medieval teaching on, 692.
Matrimony, Holy, 605.
Maurice, F. D., 292.
Medd, P. G., 96.
Mediation of Christ, 152.
Medieval errors condemned in the Articles, 21.
Melanthon, 463, 590.
Melchiades, 779.
Melito of Sardis, 255.
Messianic hope in the Old Testament, 285.
Micronius, Martin, 23, 161.
Mill, W. H., 246.
Milligan, Professor, 189.
- Milman, Dean, 483.
Ministry, the threefold, 731 *seq.*
Moberly, Bishop, 663.
Moehler, 237.
Monarchia, doctrine of the, 115.
Montague, Bishop, 48, 49, 570, 727.
Montanism, 205, 449.
Moral law binding on Christians, 294.
Mozley, J. B., 352, 478, 671, 693.
Muratori, 333.
Muratorian fragment on the Canon, 267.
- NAG's Head fable, the, 749.
Neal, D., 55.
Necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man, 5, 380, 641, 702.
Neo-Cæsarea, Council of, 700, 711.
Nestorius, heresy of, 136.
New Testament, Canon of, 261; MSS. of, 261; versions of, 263; catalogues of, 265; citations of, 268; language of Article VI. on, 271.
Newdigate, Sir R., 63.
Newman, J. H., 114, 237, 274.
Nicæa, Council of, 124, 520, 533, 698.
Nicæa, Second Council of, 533, 559.
Nicene Creed, original form of, 316; enlarged form of, 318; date and object of the enlargement, 321; possibly sanctioned at Constantinople, 324; not noticed at Ephesus, 324; sanctioned at Chalcedon, 324; additions at Toledo, 215; Latin version of, 327; English translation of, 327.
Nicholas I., Pope, 224.
Nicholas III., Pope, 228.
Norris, Archdeacon, 153, 155, 348.
Novatianism, 449.
- OATHS, Article on, 788; teaching of Scripture on, 789.
Old Testament, Canon of the, 252; changes in the Article on, 280; not contrary to the New, 283.
Ommanney, Preb., 339.
Opus operatum, meaning of the phrase, 612.

- Orders, Holy, 605.
- Ordinal, objections of the Puritans to, 731; objections of the Romanists to, 748; validity of the Anglican, 753.
- Ordination, formula of, 746; objections of the Puritans to, 747; objections of the Romanists to, 753.
- Origen, his use of *Ousia* and *Hy-po-stasis*, 107, 108; on eternal generation, 123; uses the term *Homocousios*, 126; on 1 Pet. iii. 18, 171; on the term Canonical, 249; on the Canon of Scripture, 255; on predestination, 471; wrongly quoted for invocation of saints, 564; on worship, 583; on the baptism of infants, 638.
- Original sin, Article on, 357; its object, 358; origin of the phrase, 360; Scriptural teaching on, 362.
- Original righteousness, 364; teaching of the Fathers on, 366.
- Ousia*, history of the term, 107.
- Oxenham, H. N., 155.
- PALMER, Sir W., 241, 242, 244, 536.
- Papal claims, growth of, 776.
- Papal jurisdiction, evidence of Scripture concerning, 773.
- Papias, 269.
- Paradise, 166.
- Pardons. See *Indulgences*.
- Parker, Archbishop, prepares the Thirty-Eight Articles, 30, 32; suggests clause in Art. XXVIII., 36; change made by him, 120, 160, 198, 259, 378; on the descent into hell, 161; on Art. XXIX., 669; consecration of, 748.
- Particular Redemption, 477, 487.
- Pascal II., 678.
- Paschasius Radbert, 597, 650.
- Paul of Samosata, 127, 769.
- Pearson, Bishop, on the position of the Articles, 39; on the unity of God, 91; on the Trinity, 116; on the Son of God, 121; on the descent into hell, 169, 171, 189; on the Macedonian heresy, 199; on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, 201; on the procession of the Holy Ghost, 211.
- Pelagianism, 360.
- Penance, 604.
- Penitential discipline of the Church, 711.
- Perichoresis*, doctrine of the, 117.
- Perpetua, acts of, 543.
- Perrone, 237, 659.
- Person, history of the term, 105; explanation of, 112.
- Peter, Gospel of, 176.
- Peter Damien, 652.
- Peter Lombard, 571, 597, 654.
- Philo, 254.
- Philpot, Archdeacon, his explanation of the title of the Articles, 17.
- Photius, 224.
- Pirminius on the Creed, 310.
- Pius IV., Pope, 11, 12.
- Pliny, 594.
- Plumptre, Dean, 171, 180, 436.
- Pneumatomachi, the, 208.
- Polycarp, 270; martyrdom of, 563.
- Praxeas, 106.
- Prayers for the departed not condemned in the Articles, 537.
- Predestination, Article on, 459; based on Scripture, 463; Ecclesiastical theory of, 465; Arminian theory of, 470; Roman teaching on, 471; Calvinistic theory of, 474; Augustinian theory of, 477; how to be understood, 479; Scriptural teaching on, 479.
- Presence of Christ as Man, nature of the, 193.
- Priesthood, origin of, 733.
- Procession of the Holy Ghost, doctrine of the, 209.
- Prophets in the New Testament, 737.
- Prosper, 475.
- Prynne, W., 49.
- Puller, F. W., 777.
- Purgatory, history of the doctrine of, 543; Romish doctrine of, 548; teaching of the Greek Church on, 548; evidence of Scripture on, 548.
- Pusey, E. B., 218, 219, 234, 438.
- RANSOM, Christ's death a, 155.
- Ratramn, 642, 650.

- Reccared, 215.
 Reconciliation of God to man, 146.
Redditio Symboli, 300.
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, 28, 90, 120, 182, 198, 232, 259, 359, 373, 379, 424, 441, 445, 461, 488, 494, 511, 530, 533, 574, 589, 599, 616, 645, 783, 788.
 Regeneration, meaning of the word, 623; Greek words for, 623; blessings of, 624; distinction from conversion, 632.
Regula fidei, 305.
 Relics, adoration of, 557.
 Reprobation, 477.
 Resurrection of Christ, evidence for the, 183.
 Resurrection body, nature of the, 186.
 Resurrection of the flesh, 311.
 Reynolds, Dr., 54.
 Rhabanus Maurus, 597.
 Ridley, Bishop, 642, 674, 719.
 Robertson, A., 779.
 Rogers on the Articles, 616.
 Roman Creed, early, 306.
 Rome, Church of, 506 *seq.*
 Roscellinus, 111.
 Row, Prebendary, 186.
 Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles, 47.
 Royal Supremacy. See *Supremacy*.
 Rufinus on the Creed, 178, 304 *seq.*, 314; on the Canon of Scripture, 249, 256, 265, 275.
 SABELLIANISM, 106, 206.
 Sacraments, Zwinglian views of, 588; teaching of the Article on, 588; Anabaptist view of, 588; Calvinistic view of, 590; number of, 593; history of the word, 594; teaching of the Greek Church on, 598; difference between England and Rome on, 601.
 Sacrifice, Christ's death a, 148.
 Sacrifice of Masses. See *Masses*.
 Salmon, Dr., 778.
Salvus, meaning of the word, 347.
 Sampson, 41.
 Sanctification, meaning of, 393.
 Sanday, Professor, 148, 269, 271, 363, 396, 400, 469.
 Sardica, Council of, 779.
Scarapsus, 310.
 Schoolmen, the, 368, 418.
 Session at the right hand of God, meaning of the expression, 192; evidence for, 192.
Sheol, Hebrew conception of, 163.
 Sherlock, Dean, 111.
 Socrates, 177, 324, 518, 699.
 Son, meaning of the term, 122.
 Son of God, eternal generation of, 122 *seq.*; incarnation of, 135 *seq.*; union of two natures in one person, 137; atonement of, 145 *seq.*
 South, Dr., 111.
 Stephen of Autun, 652.
 Subscription to the Articles required by Parliament, 43; required by Convocation, 57; form of, modified, 63; not required from the laity, 64; history of, at the universities, 64.
 Substance, history of the term, 107.
 Supererogation, works of, Article on, 424; history of the word, 425.
 Supremacy, Royal, history of, 761 *seq.*; meaning of, 765 *seq.*
 Swainson, Professor, 335.
 Swete, Professor, 104, 177, 205, 208, 213, 310 *seq.*
Symbolum, meaning of the term, 304.
 TARASIVS, Patriarch of Constantinople, 221.
 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 242.
 Ten Articles of 1536, the, 3.
 Tertullian, 105, 107, 108, 140, 166, 176, 213, 241, 248, 269, 275, 298, 303, 311, 453, 455, 543, 555, 557, 595, 638, 785.
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 216, 225.
 Theodore of Tarsus, 220.
 Theodoret, 216, 324.
 Theodotus, 105.
 Theophilus of Antioch, 105, 204, 366.
Theotocos, title of, 136.
Thesaurus ecclesie, 434.
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 659.
 Thirteen Articles of 1538, 7.
 Thirty-Eight Articles of 1563, history of the, 30; compared with the Forty-Two Articles, 38;

- indebted to the Confession of Württemberg, 38; submitted to Convocation, 30; changes introduced by the Queen, 31.
- Thirty-Nine Articles, revision of 1571, 42; their true character, 38, 52; Latin and English both authoritative, 46; Royal declaration prefixed to, 50; Puritan objections to, 51 *seq.*; subscription to. See *Subscription*.
- Toledo, third Council of, 215.
- Traditio Symboli*, 300.
- Tradition and Scripture, 236 *seq.*
- Traditions, Article on, 717. Cf. 514 *seq.*
- Transubstantiation, history of the doctrine, 649; meaning of the word, 653; how far accepted by the Greeks, 653; why condemned, 656.
- Trench, Archbishop, 418.
- Trent, Council of, 10; on the authority of Scripture, 235; on the Canon of the Old Testament, 252; on original sin, 375; on justification, 394, 405; on good works, 411; on predestination, 487; on purgatory, 538; on pardons, 539; on adoration of images and relics, 540; on invocation of saints, 541; on the use of Latin in the Mass, 584; on sacraments, 598; on the sacrifice of the Mass, 693; on Extreme Unction, 608; on grace *ex opere operato*, 612; on transubstantiation, 655; on the Eucharist, 664, 674; on concomitance, 680; on clerical celibacy, 704.
- Trinity, the Holy, preparation for the doctrine in the Old Testament, 93; revelation of, in the New Testament, 98; the doctrine agreeable to reason, 101; first occurrence of the word, 104; meaning of the doctrine, 114; priority of order in the, 116.
- Trullo, Council in, 699.
- UNCTION of the sick, history of, 605. See also *Extreme Unction*.
- Unction, gift of, 142.
- Usher, Archbishop, 333, 567.
- Utrecht Psalter, the, 334.
- VARIATIONS in Church Services, 719.
- Vasquez, 685, 692.
- Vatican Council, the, 773.
- Vaughan, Dean, 134, 204.
- Venantius Fortunatus, 178, 334.
- Victor, Pope, 778.
- Vincent of Lerins, 242, 343.
- Virgin, Christ born of a, 140; immaculate conception of the, 440.
- WAKEMAN, H. O., 764, 771.
- War, lawfulness of, 781.
- Waterland, D., on the Articles, 46; on subscription, 62; vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity, 111; on the Athanasian Creed, 331 *seq.*; on good works, 413 *seq.*; on blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 448.
- Watson, Bishop, 676.
- Westcott, Bishop, 97, 117, 122, 130, 134, 156, 169, 184, 185, 186, 188, 191, 211, 250, 256, 258, 302, 450 *seq.*, 558, 676.
- Westminster Assembly of Divines, 55, 376.
- Westminster Confession, the, 369.
- Westminster, Council of, 701.
- Whitaker, Professor, 54.
- Whitgift, Archbishop, three Articles of, 58; subscription to them required by the Canons of 1604, 59.
- William of Occam, 526.
- Winchester, Council of, 701.
- Wiseman, Cardinal, 237.
- Witmund, 673.
- Woolton, 422.
- Württemberg, Confession of. See *Confession*.
- ZOSIMUS, Pope, 507, 779.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED, EDINBURGH

A CATALOGUE OF BOOKS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS OF METHUEN AND COMPANY PUBLISHERS : LONDON 36 ESSEX STREET W.C.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FORTHCOMING BOOKS,	2
POETRY,	9
ENGLISH CLASSICS,	10
ILLUSTRATED BOOKS,	11
HISTORY,	12
BIOGRAPHY,	14
GENERAL LITERATURE,	15
SCIENCE,	18
PHILOSOPHY,	19
THEOLOGY,	20
LEADERS OF RELIGION,	21
FICTION,	22
BOOKS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS,	31
THE PEACOCK LIBRARY,	32
UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERIES,	32
SOCIAL QUESTIONS OF TO-DAY,	34
CLASSICAL TRANSLATIONS,	35
EDUCATIONAL BOOKS,	36

OCTOBER 1896

OCTOBER 1896.

MESSRS. METHUEN'S

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Poetry

RUDYARD KIPLING

BALLADS. By RUDYARD KIPLING. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

150 copies on hand-made paper. *Demy 8vo.* 21s.

30 copies on Japanese paper. *Demy 8vo.* 42s.

The enormous success of 'Barrack Room Ballads' justifies the expectation that this volume, so long postponed, will have an equal, if not a greater, success.

GEORGE WYNDHAM

SHAKESPEARE'S POEMS. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by GEORGE WYNDHAM, M.P. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

[*English Classics.*]

W. E. HENLEY

ENGLISH LYRICS. Selected and Edited by W. E. HENLEY. *Crown 8vo.* *Buckram.* 6s.

Also 15 copies on Japanese paper. *Demy 8vo.* £2, 2s.

Few announcements will be more welcome to lovers of English verse than the one that Mr. Henley is bringing together into one book the finest lyrics in our language. The volume will be produced with the same care that made 'Lyra Heroica' delightful to the hand and eye.

'Q'

POEMS AND BALLADS. By 'Q,' Author of 'Green Bays, etc. *Crown 8vo.* *Buckram.* 3s. 6d.

25 copies on Japanese paper. *Demy 8vo.* 21s.

History, Biography, and Travel

CAPTAIN HINDE

THE FALL OF THE CONGO ARABS. By SIDNEY L. HINDE. With Portraits and Plans. *Demy 8vo.* 12s. 6d.

This volume deals with the recent Belgian Expedition to the Upper Congo, which developed into a war between the State forces and the Arab slave-raiders in Central Africa. Two white men only returned alive from the three years' war—Commandant Dhanis and the writer of this book, Captain Hinde. During the greater part of the time spent by Captain Hinde in the Congo he was amongst cannibal races in little-known regions, and, owing to the peculiar circumstances of his position, was enabled to see a side of native history shown to few Europeans. The war terminated in the complete defeat of the Arabs, seventy thousand of whom perished during the struggle.

S. BARING GOULD

THE LIFE OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. By S. BARING GOULD. With over 450 Illustrations in the Text and 13 Photogravure Plates. *Large quarto.* 36s.

This study of the most extraordinary life in history is written rather for the general reader than for the military student, and while following the main lines of Napoleon's career, is concerned chiefly with the development of his character and his personal qualities. Special stress is laid on his early life—the period in which his mind and character took their definite shape and direction.

The great feature of the book is its wealth of illustration. There are over 450 illustrations, large and small, in the text, and there are also more than a dozen full page photogravures. Every important incident of Napoleon's career has its illustration, while there are a large number of portraits of his contemporaries, reproductions of famous pictures, of contemporary caricatures, of his handwriting, etc. etc.

It is not too much to say that no such magnificent book on Napoleon has ever been published.

VICTOR HUGO

THE LETTERS OF VICTOR HUGO. Translated from the French by F. CLARKE, M.A. *In Two Volumes. Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d. each. *Vol. I.*

This is the first volume of one of the most interesting and important collection of letters ever published in France. The correspondence dates from Victor Hugo's boyhood to his death, and none of the letters have been published before. The arrangement is chiefly chronological, but where there is an interesting set of letters to one person these are arranged together. The first volume contains, among others, (1) Letters to his father; (2) to his young wife; (3) to his confessor, Lamennais; (4) a very important set of about fifty letters to Sainte-Beuve; (5) letters about his early books and plays.

J. M. RIGG

ST. ANSELM OF CANTERBURY: A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. By J. M. RIGG, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. *Demy 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

This work gives for the first time in moderate compass a complete portrait of St. Anselm, exhibiting him in his intimate and interior as well as in his public life. Thus, while the great ecclesiastico-political struggle in which he played so prominent a part is fully dealt with, unusual prominence is given to the profound and subtle speculations by which he permanently influenced theological and metaphysical thought; while it will be a surprise to most readers to find him also appearing as the author of some of the most exquisite religious poetry in the Latin language.

EDWARD GIBBON

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By EDWARD GIBBON. A New Edition, edited with Notes, Appendices, and Maps by J. B. BURY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. *In Seven Volumes. Demy 8vo, gilt top.* 8s. 6d. each. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. each. *Vol. II.*

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE

A HISTORY OF EGYPT, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. Edited by W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L., LL.D., Professor of Egyptology at University College. *Fully Illustrated. In Six Volumes. Crown 8vo. 6s. each.*

Vol. II. XVII.-XVIII. DYNASTIES. W. M. F. PETRIE.

'A history written in the spirit of scientific precision so worthily represented by Dr. Petrie and his school cannot but promote sound and accurate study, and supply a vacant place in the English literature of Egyptology.'—*Times*.

J. WELLS

A SHORT HISTORY OF ROME. By J. WELLS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Wadham Coll., Oxford. With 4 Maps. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. 350 pp.*

This book is intended for the Middle and Upper Forms of Public Schools and for Pass Students at the Universities. It contains copious Tables, etc.

H. DE B. GIBBINS

THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH INDUSTRY. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A. With 5 Maps. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. Pp. 450.*

This book is written with the view of affording a clear view of the main facts of English Social and Industrial History placed in due perspective. Beginning with prehistoric times, it passes in review the growth and advance of industry up to the nineteenth century, showing its gradual development and progress. The author has endeavoured to place before his readers the history of industry as a connected whole in which all these developments have their proper place. The book is illustrated by Maps, Diagrams, and Tables, and aided by copious Footnotes.

MRS. OLIPHANT

THOMAS CHALMERS. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. [Leaders of Religion.]*

Naval and Military

DAVID HANNAY

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ROYAL NAVY, FROM EARLY TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. By DAVID HANNAY. *Illustrated. Demy 8vo. 15s.*

This book aims at giving an account not only of the fighting we have done at sea, but of the growth of the service, of the part the Navy has played in the development of the Empire, and of its inner life. The author has endeavoured to avoid the mistake of sacrificing the earlier periods of naval history—the very interesting wars with Holland in the seventeenth century, for instance, or the American War of 1779-1783—to the later struggle with Revolutionary and Imperial France.

COL. COOPER KING

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE BRITISH ARMY. By Lieut.-Colonel COOPER KING, of the Staff College, Camberley. *Illustrated.*
Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

This volume aims at describing the nature of the different armies that have been formed in Great Britain, and how from the early and feudal levies the present standing army came to be. The changes in tactics, uniform, and armament are briefly touched upon, and the campaigns in which the army has shared have been so far followed as to explain the part played by British regiments in them.

G. W. STEEVENS

NAVAL POLICY: WITH A DESCRIPTION OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN NAVIES. By G. W. STEEVENS. *Demy 8vo. 6s.*

This book is a description of the British and other more important navies of the world, with a sketch of the lines on which our naval policy might possibly be developed. It describes our recent naval policy, and shows what our naval force really is. A detailed but non-technical account is given of the instruments of modern warfare—guns, armour, engines, and the like—with a view to determine how far we are abreast of modern invention and modern requirements. An ideal policy is then sketched for the building and manning of our fleet; and the last chapter is devoted to docks, coaling-stations, and especially colonial defence.

Theology

F. B. JEVONS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.
By F. B. JEVONS, M.A., Litt.D., Fellow of the University of Durham. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.*

This is the third number of the series of 'Theological Handbooks' edited by Dr. Robertson of Durham, in which have already appeared Dr. Gibson's 'XXXIX. Articles' and Mr. Otley's 'Incarnation.'

Mr. F. B. Jevons' 'Introduction to the History of Religion' treats of early religion, from the point of view of Anthropology and Folk-lore; and is the first attempt that has been made in any language to weave together the results of recent investigations into such topics as Sympathetic Magic, Taboo, Totemism, Fetishism, etc., so as to present a systematic account of the growth of primitive religion and the development of early religious institutions.

W. YORKE FAUSSETT

THE DE CATECHIZANDIS RUDIBUS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., by W. YORKE FAUSSETT, M.A., late Scholar of Balliol Coll. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

An edition of a Treatise on the Essentials of Christian Doctrine, and the best methods of impressing them on candidates for baptism. The editor bestows upon this patristic work the same care which a treatise of Cicero might claim. There is a general Introduction, a careful Analysis, a full Commentary, and other useful matter. No better introduction to the study of the Latin Fathers, their style and diction, could be found than this treatise, which also has no lack of modern interest.

General Literature

C. F. ANDREWS

CHRISTIANITY AND THE LABOUR QUESTION. By
C. F. ANDREWS, B.A. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

R. E. STEEL

MAGNETISM AND ELECTRICITY. By R. ELLIOTT
STEEL, M.A., F.C.S. With Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

G. LOWES DICKINSON

THE GREEK VIEW OF LIFE. By G. L. DICKINSON,
Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
[*University Extension Series.*

J. A. HOBSON

THE PROBLEM OF THE UNEMPLOYED. By J. A.
HOBSON, B.A., Author of 'The Problems of Poverty.' *Crown 8vo.*
2s. 6d. [Social Questions Series.

S. E. BALLY

GERMAN COMMERCIAL CORRESPONDENCE. By S.
E. BALLY, Assistant Master at the Manchester Grammar School.
Crown 8vo. 2s. [Commercial Series.

L. F. PRICE

ECONOMIC ESSAYS. By L. F. PRICE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel
College, Oxford. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

This book consists of a number of Studies in Economics and Industrial and Social Problems.

Fiction

MARIE CORELLI'S ROMANCES

FIRST COMPLETE AND UNIFORM EDITION

Large crown 8vo. 6s.

MESSRS. METHUEN beg to announce that they have commenced the publication of a New and Uniform Edition of MARIE CORELLI'S Romances. This Edition is revised by the Author, and contains new Prefaces. The volumes are being issued at short intervals in the following order :—

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. A ROMANCE OF TWO WORLDS. | 2. VENDETTA. |
| 3. THELMA. | 4. ARDATH. |
| 5. THE SOUL OF LILITH. | 6. WORMWOOD. |
| 7. BARABBAS. | 8. THE SORROWS OF SATAN. |

BARING GOULD

DARTMOOR IDYLLS. By S. BARING GOULD. *Cr. 8vo. 6s.*

GUAVAS THE TINNER. By S. BARING GOULD, Author of 'Mehalah,' 'The Broom Squire,' etc. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

THE PENNYCOMEQUICKS. By S. BARING GOULD. New Edition. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

A new edition, uniform with the Author's other novels.

LUCAS MALET

THE CARISSIMA. By LUCAS MALET, Author of 'The Wages of Sin,' etc. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

This is the first novel which Lucas Malet has written since her very powerful 'The Wages of Sin.'

ARTHUR MORRISON

A CHILD OF THE JAGO. By ARTHUR MORRISON. Author of 'Tales of Mean Streets.' *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

This, the first long story which Mr. Morrison has written, is like his remarkable 'Tales of Mean Streets,' a realistic study of East End life.

W. E. NORRIS

CLARISSA FURIOSA. By W. E. NORRIS, 'Author of 'The Rogue,' etc. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

L. COPE CORNFORD

CAPTAIN JACOBUS: A ROMANCE OF HIGHWAYMEN. By L. COPE CORNFORD. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

J. BLOUNDELLE BURTON

DENOUNCED. By J. BLOUNDELLE BURTON, Author of 'In the Day of Adversity,' etc. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

J. MACLAREN COBBAN

WILT THOU HAVE THIS WOMAN? By J. M. COBBAN, Author of 'The King of Andaman.' *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

J. F. BREWER

THE SPECULATORS. By J. F. BREWER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

A. BALFOUR

BY STROKE OF SWORD. By ANDREW BALFOUR. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

8 MESSRS. METHUEN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

M. A. OWEN

THE DAUGHTER OF ALOUETTE. By MARY A. OWEN.

Crown 8vo. 6s.

A story of life among the American Indians.

RONALD ROSS

THE SPIRIT OF STORM. By RONALD ROSS, Author of
'The Child of Ocean.' *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

A romance of the Sea.

J. A. BARRY

IN THE GREAT DEEP: TALES OF THE SEA. By J. A.
BARRY. Author of 'Steve Brown's Bunyip.' *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

JAMES GORDON

THE VILLAGE AND THE DOCTOR. By JAMES GORDON.

Crown 8vo. 6s.

BERTRAM MITFORD

THE SIGN OF THE SPIDER. By BERTRAM MITFORD.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A story of South Africa.

A. SHIELD

THE SQUIRE OF WANDALES. By A. SHIELD. *Crown 8vo.*
3s. 6d.

G. W. STEEVENS

MONOLOGUES OF THE DEAD. By G. W. STEEVENS.

Foolscap 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A series of Soliloquies in which famous men of antiquity—Julius Cæsar, Nero, Alcibiades, etc., attempt to express themselves in the modes of thought and language of to-day.

S. GORDON

A HANDFUL OF EXOTICS. By S. GORDON. *Crown 8vo.*
3s. 6d.

A volume of stories of Jewish life in Russia.

P. NEUMANN

THE SUPPLANTER. By P. NEUMANN. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

EVELYN DICKINSON

THE SIN OF ANGELS. By EVELYN DICKINSON. *Crown 8vo.*
3s. 6d.

H. A. KENNEDY

A MAN WITH BLACK EYELASHES. By H. A. KENNEDY.
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A LIST OF
MESSRS. METHUEN'S
PUBLICATIONS

Poetry

Rudyard Kipling. BARRACK-ROOM BALLADS; And Other Verses. By RUDYARD KIPLING. *Ninth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'Mr. Kipling's verse is strong, vivid, full of character. . . . Unmistakable genius rings in every line.'—*Times*.

'"Barrack-Room Ballads" contains some of the best work that Mr. Kipling has ever done, which is saying a good deal. "Fuzzy-Wuzzy," "Gunga Din," and "Tommy," are, in our opinion, altogether superior to anything of the kind that English literature has hitherto produced.'—*Athenæum*.

'The ballads teem with imagination, they palpitate with emotion. We read them with laughter and tears; the metres throb in our pulses, the cunningly ordered words tingle with life; and if this be not poetry, what is?'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

"Q." THE GOLDEN POMP: A Procession of English Lyrics from Surrey to Shirley, arranged by A. T. QUILLER COUCH. *Crown 8vo. Buckram. 6s.*

'A delightful volume: a really golden "Pomp."'—*Spectator*.

"Q." GREEN BAYS: Verses and Parodies. By "Q," Author of 'Dead Man's Rock,' etc. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

'The verses display a rare and versatile gift of parody, great command of metre, and a very pretty turn of humour.'—*Times*.

H. C. Beeching. LYRA SACRA: An Anthology of Sacred Verse. Edited by H. C. BEECHING, M.A. *Crown 8vo. Buckram. 6s.*

'An anthology of high excellence.'—*Athenæum*.

'A charming selection, which maintains a lofty standard of excellence.'—*Times*.

W. B. Yeats. AN ANTHOLOGY OF IRISH VERSE. Edited by W. B. YEATS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

'An attractive and catholic selection.'—*Times*.

'It is edited by the most original and most accomplished of modern Irish poets, and against his editing but a single objection can be brought, namely, that it excludes from the collection his own delicate lyrics.'—*Saturday Review*.

E. Mackay. A SONG OF THE SEA: MY LADY OF DREAMS, AND OTHER POEMS. By ERIC MACKAY, Author of 'The Love Letters of a Violinist.' *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo, gilt top. 5s.*

'Everywhere Mr. Mackay displays himself the master of a style marked by all the characteristics of the best rhetoric. He has a keen sense of rhythm and of general balance; his verse is excellently sonorous.'—*Globe*.

'Throughout the book the poetic workmanship is fine.'—*Scotsman*.

Ibsen. BRAND. A Drama by HENRIK IBSEN. Translated by WILLIAM WILSON. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

'The greatest world-poem of the nineteenth century next to "Faust." It is in the same set with "Agamemnon," with "Lear," with the literature that we now instinctively regard as high and holy.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

"A. G." VERSES TO ORDER. By "A. G." *Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*

A small volume of verse by a writer whose initials are well known to Oxford men.

'A capital specimen of light academic poetry. These verses are very bright and engaging, easy and sufficiently witty.'—*St. James's Gazette*.

F. Langbridge. BALLADS OF THE BRAVE: Poems of Chivalry, Enterprise, Courage, and Constancy, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. Edited, with Notes, by Rev. F. LANGBRIDGE. *Crown 8vo. Buckram. 3s. 6d. School Edition. 2s. 6d.*

'A very happy conception happily carried out. These "Ballads of the Brave" are intended to suit the real tastes of boys, and will suit the taste of the great majority.'—*Spectator*.

'The book is full of splendid things.'—*World*.

Lang and Craigie. THE POEMS OF ROBERT BURNS. Edited by ANDREW LANG and W. A. CRAIGIE. With Portrait. *Demy 8vo, gilt top. 6s.*

This edition contains a carefully collated Text, numerous Notes, critical and textual, a critical and biographical Introduction, and a Glossary.

'Among the editions in one volume, Mr. Andrew Lang's will take the place of authority.'—*Times*.

'To the general public the beauty of its type, and the fair proportions of its pages, as well as the excellent chronological arrangement of the poems, should make it acceptable enough. Mr. Lang and his publishers have certainly succeeded in producing an attractive popular edition of the poet, in which the brightly written biographical introduction is not the least notable feature.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

English Classics

Edited by W. E. HENLEY.

'Very dainty volumes are these; the paper, type, and light-green binding are all very agreeable to the eye. *Simplex munditiis* is the phrase that might be applied to them.'—*Globe*.

'The volumes are strongly bound in green buckram, are of a convenient size, and pleasant to look upon, so that whether on the shelf, or on the table, or in the hand the possessor is thoroughly content with them.'—*Guardian*.

'The paper, type, and binding of this edition are in excellent taste, and leave nothing to be desired by lovers of literature.'—*Standard*.

THE LIFE AND OPINIONS OF TRISTRAM SHANDY. By LAWRENCE STERNE. With an Introduction by CHARLES WHIBLEY, and a Portrait. *2 vols. 7s.*

THE COMEDIES OF WILLIAM CONGREVE. With an Introduction by G. S. STREET, and a Portrait. *2 vols. 7s.*

THE ADVENTURES OF HAJJI BABA OF ISPAHAN.
By JAMES MORIER. With an Introduction by E. G. BROWNE, M.A.,
and a Portrait. 2 vols. 7s.

THE LIVES OF DONNE, WOTTON, HOOKER, HERBERT, AND SANDERSON. By IZAAK WALTON. With an
Introduction by VERNON BLACKBURN, and a Portrait. 3s. 6d.

THE LIVES OF THE ENGLISH POETS. By SAMUEL JOHNSON, LL.D. With an Introduction by J. H. MILLAR, and a
Portrait. 3 vols. 10s. 6d.

Illustrated Books

Jane Barlow. THE BATTLE OF THE FROGS AND MICE,
translated by JANE BARLOW, Author of 'Irish Idylls,' and pictured
by F. D. BEDFORD. Small 4to. 6s. net.

S. Baring Gould. A BOOK OF FAIRY TALES retold by S.
BARING GOULD. With numerous illustrations and initial letters by
ARTHUR J. GASKIN. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram. 6s.

'Mr. Baring Gould has done a good deed, and is deserving of gratitude, in re-writing in honest, simple style the old stories that delighted the childhood of "our fathers and grandfathers." We do not think he has omitted any of our favourite stories, the stories that are commonly regarded as merely "old fashioned," As to the form of the book, and the printing, which is by Messrs. Constable, it were difficult to commend overmuch. —Saturday Review.

S. Baring Gould. OLD ENGLISH FAIRY TALES. Col-
lected and edited by S. BARING GOULD. With Numerous Illustra-
tions by F. D. BEDFORD. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram. 6s.

'A charming volume, which children will be sure to appreciate. The stories have been selected with great ingenuity from various old ballads and folk-tales, and, having been somewhat altered and readjusted, now stand forth, clothed in Mr. Baring Gould's delightful English, to enchant youthful readers. All the tales are good.'—Guardian.

S. Baring Gould. A BOOK OF NURSERY SONGS AND
RHYMES. Edited by S. BARING GOULD, and Illustrated by the
Birmingham Art School. Buckram, gilt top. Crown 8vo. 6s.

'The volume is very complete in its way, as it contains nursery songs to the number of 77, game-rhymes, and jingles. To the student we commend the sensible introduction, and the explanatory notes. The volume is superbly printed on soft, thick paper, which it is a pleasure to touch; and the borders and pictures are, as we have said, among the very best specimens we have seen of the Gaskin school.' —Birmingham Gazette.

H. C. Beeching. A BOOK OF CHRISTMAS VERSE. Edited by H. C. BEECHING, M.A., and Illustrated by WALTER CRANE. *Crown 8vo, gilt top.* 5s.

A collection of the best verse inspired by the birth of Christ from the Middle Ages to the present day. A distinction of the book is the large number of poems it contains by modern authors, a few of which are here printed for the first time.

'An anthology which, from its unity of aim and high poetic excellence, has a better right to exist than most of its fellows.'—*Guardian*.

History

Gibbon. THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By EDWARD GIBBON. A New Edition, Edited with Notes, Appendices, and Maps, by J. B. BURY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. *In Seven Volumes. Demy 8vo. Gilt top.* 8s. 6d. each. Also crown 8vo. 6s. each. Vol. I.

'The time has certainly arrived for a new edition of Gibbon's great work. . . . Professor Bury is the right man to undertake this task. His learning is amazing, both in extent and accuracy. The book is issued in a handy form, and at a moderate price, and it is admirably printed.'—*Times*.

'The edition is edited as a classic should be edited, removing nothing, yet indicating the value of the text, and bringing it up to date. It promises to be of the utmost value, and will be a welcome addition to many libraries.'—*Scotsman*.

'This edition, so far as one may judge from the first instalment, is a marvel of erudition and critical skill, and it is the very minimum of praise to predict that the seven volumes of it will supersede Dean Milman's as the standard edition of our great historical classic.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

'The beau-ideal Gibbon has arrived at last.'—*Sketch*.

'At last there is an adequate modern edition of Gibbon. . . . The best edition the nineteenth century could produce.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

Flinders Petrie. A HISTORY OF EGYPT, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. Edited by W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L., LL.D., Professor of Egyptology at University College. *Fully Illustrated. In Six Volumes. Crown 8vo. 6s. each.*

VOL. I. PREHISTORIC TIMES TO XVI. DYNASTY. W. M. F. PETRIE. *Second Edition.*

'A history written in the spirit of scientific precision so worthily represented by Dr. Petrie and his school cannot but promote sound and accurate study, and supply a vacant place in the English literature of Egyptology.'—*Times*.

Flinders Petrie. EGYPTIAN TALES. Edited by W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Illustrated by TRISTRAM ELLIS. *In Two Volumes. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.*

'A valuable addition to the literature of comparative folk-lore. The drawings are really illustrations in the literal sense of the word.'—*Globe*.

'It has a scientific value to the student of history and archæology.'—*Scotsman*.

'Invaluable as a picture of life in Palestine and Egypt.'—*Daily News*.

Flinders Petrie. EGYPTIAN DECORATIVE ART. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L. With 120 Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

'Professor Flinders Petrie is not only a profound Egyptologist, but an accomplished student of comparative archæology. In these lectures, delivered at the Royal Institution, he displays both qualifications with rare skill in elucidating the development of decorative art in Egypt, and in tracing its influence on the art of other countries. Few experts can speak with higher authority and wider knowledge than the Professor himself, and in any case his treatment of his subject is full of learning and insight.'—*Times*.

S. Baring Gould. THE TRAGEDY OF THE CÆSARS. The Emperors of the Julian and Claudian Lines. With numerous Illustrations from Busts, Gems, Cameos, etc. By S. BARING GOULD, Author of 'Mehalah,' etc. *Third Edition.* *Royal 8vo.* 15s.

'A most splendid and fascinating book on a subject of undying interest. The great feature of the book is the use the author has made of the existing portraits of the Cæsars, and the admirable critical subtlety he has exhibited in dealing with this line of research. It is brilliantly written, and the illustrations are supplied on a scale of profuse magnificence.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

'The volumes will in no sense disappoint the general reader. Indeed, in their way, there is nothing in any sense so good in English. . . . Mr. Baring Gould has presented his narrative in such a way as not to make one dull page.'—*Athenæum*.

A. Clark. THE COLLEGES OF OXFORD: Their History, their Traditions. By Members of the University. Edited by A. CLARK, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College. *8vo.* 12s. 6d.

'A work which will certainly be appealed to for many years as the standard book on the Colleges of Oxford.'—*Athenæum*.

Perrens. THE HISTORY OF FLORENCE FROM 1434 TO 1492. By F. T. PERRENS. Translated by HANNAH LYNCH. *8vo.* 12s. 6d.

A history of Florence under the domination of Cosimo, Piero, and Lorenzo de Medicis.

'This is a standard book by an honest and intelligent historian, who has deserved well of all who are interested in Italian history.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

E. L. S. Horsburgh. THE CAMPAIGN OF WATERLOO. By E. L. S. HORSBURGH, B.A. *With Plans.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

'A brilliant essay—simple, sound, and thorough.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

'A study, the most concise, the most lucid, the most critical that has been produced.'—*Birmingham Mercury*.

'A careful and precise study, a fair and impartial criticism, and an eminently readable book.'—*Admiralty and Horse Guards Gazette*.

H. B. George. BATTLES OF ENGLISH HISTORY. By H. B. GEORGE, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. *With numerous Plans.* *Third Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

'Mr. George has undertaken a very useful task—that of making military affairs intelligible and instructive to non-military readers—and has executed it with laudable intelligence and industry, and with a large measure of success.'—*Times*.

'This book is almost a revelation; and we heartily congratulate the author on his work and on the prospect of the reward he has well deserved for so much conscientious and sustained labour.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

- O. Browning.** A SHORT HISTORY OF MEDIÆVAL ITALY, A.D. 1250-1530. By OSCAR BROWNING, Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. *Second Edition. In Two Volumes. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.*

VOL. I. 1250-1409.—Guelphs and Ghibellines.

VOL. II. 1409-1530.—The Age of the Condottieri.

'A vivid picture of mediæval Italy.'—*Standard*.

'Mr. Browning is to be congratulated on the production of a work of immense labour and learning.'—*Westminster Gazette*.

- O'Grady.** THE STORY OF IRELAND. By STANDISH O'GRADY, Author of 'Finn and his Companions.' *Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

'Most delightful, most stimulating. Its racy humour, its original imaginings, make it one of the freshest, breeziest volumes.'—*Methodist Times*.

'A survey at once graphic, acute, and quaintly written.'—*Times*.

Biography

- R. L. Stevenson.** VAILIMA LETTERS. By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. With an Etched Portrait by WILLIAM STRANG, and other Illustrations. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram. 7s. 6d.*

'The Vailima Letters are rich in all the varieties of that charm which have secured for Stevenson the affection of many others besides "journalists, fellow-novelists, and boys."—*The Times*.

'Few publications have in our time been more eagerly awaited than these "Vailima Letters," giving the first fruits of the correspondence of Robert Louis Stevenson. But, high as the tide of expectation has run, no reader can possibly be disappointed in the result.'—*St. James's Gazette*.

'For the student of English literature these letters indeed are a treasure. They are more like "Scott's Journal" in kind than any other literary autobiography.'—*National Observer*.

- F. W. Joyce.** THE LIFE OF SIR FREDERICK GORE OUSELEY. By F. W. JOYCE, M.A. With Portraits and Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

'All the materials have been well digested, and the book gives us a complete picture of the life of one who will ever be held in loving remembrance by his personal friends, and who in the history of music in this country will always occupy a prominent position on account of the many services he rendered to the art.'—*Musical News*.

'This book has been undertaken in quite the right spirit, and written with sympathy, insight, and considerable literary skill.'—*Times*.

- W. G. Collingwood.** THE LIFE OF JOHN RUSKIN. By W. G. COLLINGWOOD, M.A., Editor of Mr. Ruskin's Poems. With numerous Portraits, and 13 Drawings by Mr. Ruskin. *Second Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.*

'No more magnificent volumes have been published for a long time.'—*Times*.

'It is long since we had a biography with such delights of substance and of form. Such a book is a pleasure for the day, and a joy for ever.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

'A noble monument of a noble subject. One of the most beautiful books about one of the noblest lives of our century.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

C. Waldstein. JOHN RUSKIN: a Study. By CHARLES WALDSTEIN, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. With a Photogravure Portrait after Professor HERKOMER. *Post 8vo.* 5s.

'A thoughtful, impartial, well-written criticism of Ruskin's teaching, intended to separate what the author regards as valuable and permanent from what is transient and erroneous in the great master's writing.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

W. H. Hutton. THE LIFE OF SIR THOMAS MORE. By W. H. HUTTON, M.A., Author of 'William Laud.' *With Portraits.* *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

'The book lays good claim to high rank among our biographies. It is excellently, even lovingly, written.'—*Scotsman*.

'An excellent monograph.'—*Times*.

'A most complete presentation.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

M. Kaufmann. CHARLES KINGSLEY. By M. KAUFMANN, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* *Buckram.* 5s.

A biography of Kingsley, especially dealing with his achievements in social reform.

'The author has certainly gone about his work with conscientiousness and industry.'—*Sheffield Daily Telegraph*.

A. F. Robbins. THE EARLY LIFE OF WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE. By A. F. ROBBINS. *With Portraits.* *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

'Considerable labour and much skill of presentation have not been unworthily expended on this interesting work.'—*Times*.

Clark Russell. THE LIFE OF ADMIRAL LORD COLLINGWOOD. By W. CLARK RUSSELL, Author of 'The Wreck of the Grosvenor.' With Illustrations by F. BRANGWYN. *Third Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

'A most excellent and wholesome book, which we should like to see in the hands of every boy in the country.'—*St. James's Gazette*.

'A really good book.'—*Saturday Review*.

Southey. ENGLISH SEAMEN (Howard, Clifford, Hawkins, Drake, Cavendish). By ROBERT SOUTHEY. Edited, with an Introduction, by DAVID HANNAY. *Second Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

'Admirable and well-told stories of our naval history.'—*Army and Navy Gazette*.

'A brave, inspiring book.'—*Black and White*.

'The work of a master of style, and delightful all through.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

General Literature

S. Baring Gould. OLD COUNTRY LIFE. By S. BARING GOULD, Author of 'Mehalah,' etc. With Sixty-seven Illustrations by W. PARKINSON, F. D. BEDFORD, and F. MASEY. *Large Crown 8vo.* 10s. 6d. *Fifth and Cheaper Edition.* 6s.

"Old Country Life," as healthy wholesome reading, full of breezy life and movement, full of quaint stories vigorously told, will not be excelled by any book to be published throughout the year. Sound, hearty, and English to the core.'—*World*.

S. Baring Gould. HISTORIC ODDITIES AND STRANGE EVENTS. By S. BARING GOULD. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'A collection of exciting and entertaining chapters. The whole volume is delightful reading.'—*Times*.

S. Baring Gould. FREAKS OF FANATICISM. By S. BARING GOULD. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'Mr. Baring Gould has a keen eye for colour and effect, and the subjects he has chosen give ample scope to his descriptive and analytic faculties. A perfectly fascinating book.'—*Scottish Leader*.

S. Baring Gould. A GARLAND OF COUNTRY SONG: English Folk Songs with their Traditional Melodies. Collected and arranged by S. BARING GOULD and H. FLEETWOOD SHEPPARD. *Demy 4to. 6s.*

S. Baring Gould. SONGS OF THE WEST: Traditional Ballads and Songs of the West of England, with their Traditional Melodies. Collected by S. BARING GOULD, M.A., and H. FLEETWOOD SHEPPARD, M.A. Arranged for Voice and Piano. In 4 Parts (containing 25 Songs each), *Parts I., II., III., 3s. each. Part IV., 5s. In one Vol., French morocco, 15s.*

'A rich collection of humour, pathos, grace, and poetic fancy.'—*Saturday Review*.

S. Baring Gould. YORKSHIRE ODDITIES AND STRANGE EVENTS. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

S. Baring Gould. STRANGE SURVIVALS AND SUPERSTITIONS. With Illustrations. By S. BARING GOULD. *Crown 8vo. Second Edition. 6s.*

'We have read Mr. Baring Gould's book from beginning to end. It is full of quaint and various information, and there is not a dull page in it.'—*Notes and Queries*.

S. Baring Gould. THE DESERTS OF SOUTHERN FRANCE. By S. BARING GOULD. With numerous Illustrations by F. D. BEDFORD, S. HUTTON, etc. *2 vols. Demy 8vo. 32s.*

This book is the first serious attempt to describe the great barren tableland that extends to the south of Limousin in the Department of Aveyron, Lot, etc., a country of dolomite cliffs, and cañons, and subterranean rivers. The region is full of prehistoric and historic interest, relics of cave-dwellers, of mediæval robbers, and of the English domination and the Hundred Years' War.

'His two richly-illustrated volumes are full of matter of interest to the geologist, the archæologist, and the student of history and manners.'—*Scotsman*.

'It deals with its subject in a manner which rarely fails to arrest attention.'—*Times*.

R. S. Baden-Powell. THE DOWNFALL OF PREMPEH. A Diary of Life with the Native Levy in Ashanti, 1895. By Lieut.-Col. BADEN-POWELL. With 21 Illustrations, a Map, and a Special Chapter on the Political and Commercial Position of Ashanti by Sir GEORGE BADEN-POWELL, K.C.M.G., M.P. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.*

'A compact, faithful, most readable record of the campaign.'—*Daily News*.

'A bluff and vigorous narrative.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

'A really interesting book.'—*Yorkshire Post*.

W. E. Gladstone. THE SPEECHES AND PUBLIC ADDRESSES OF THE RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. Edited by A. W. HUTTON, M.A., and H. J. COHEN, M.A. With Portraits. 8vo. Vols. IX. and X. 12s. 6d. each.

Henley and Whibley. A BOOK OF ENGLISH PROSE. Collected by W. E. HENLEY and CHARLES WHIBLEY. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

'A unique volume of extracts—an art gallery of early prose.'—*Birmingham Post*.
'An admirable companion to Mr. Henley's "Lyra Heroica."—*Saturday Review*.
'Quite delightful. The choice made has been excellent, and the volume has been most admirably printed by Messrs. Constable. A greater treat for those not well acquainted with pre-Restoration prose could not be imagined.'—*Athenæum*.

J. Wells. OXFORD AND OXFORD LIFE. By Members of the University. Edited by J. WELLS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

This work contains an account of life at Oxford—intellectual, social, and religious—a careful estimate of necessary expenses, a review of recent changes, a statement of the present position of the University, and chapters on Women's Education, aids to study, and University Extension.

'We congratulate Mr. Wells on the production of a readable and intelligent account of Oxford as it is at the present time, written by persons who are possessed of a close acquaintance with the system and life of the University.'—*Athenæum*.

W. M. Dixon. A PRIMER OF TENNYSON. By W. M. DIXON, M.A., Professor of English Literature at Mason College. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

'Much sound and well-expressed criticism and acute literary judgments. The bibliography is a boon.'—*Speaker*.

'No better estimate of the late Laureate's work has yet been published. His sketch of Tennyson's life contains everything essential; his bibliography is full and concise: his literary criticism is most interesting.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

W. A. Craigie. A PRIMER OF BURNS. By W. A. CRAIGIE. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

This book is planned on a method similar to the 'Primer of Tennyson.' It has also a glossary.

'A valuable addition to the literature of the poet.'—*Times*.

'An excellent short account.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

'An admirable introduction.'—*Globe*.

L. Whibley. GREEK OLIGARCHIES: THEIR ORGANISATION AND CHARACTER. By L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 6s.

'An exceedingly useful handbook: a careful and well-arranged study of an obscure subject.'—*Times*.

'Mr. Whibley is never tedious or pedantic.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

W. B. Worsfold. SOUTH AFRICA: Its History and its Future. By W. BASIL WORSFOLD, M.A. With a Map. Crown 8vo. 6s.

'An intensely interesting book.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

'A monumental work compressed into a very moderate compass.'—*World*.

- C. H. Pearson.** ESSAYS AND CRITICAL REVIEWS. By C. H. PEARSON, M.A., Author of 'National Life and Character.' Edited, with a Biographical Sketch, by H. A. STRONG, M.A., LL.D. With a Portrait. *Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d.

'These fine essays illustrate the great breadth of his historical and literary sympathies and the remarkable variety of his intellectual interests.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

'Remarkable for careful handling, breadth of view, and thorough knowledge.'—*Scotsman*.

'Charming essays.'—*Spectator*.

- Ouida.** VIEWS AND OPINIONS. By OUIDA. *Crown 8vo.* *Second Edition.* 6s.

'Ouida is outspoken, and the reader of this book will not have a dull moment. The book is full of variety, and sparkles with entertaining matter.'—*Speaker*.

- J. S. Shedlock.** THE PIANOFORTE SONATA: Its Origin and Development. By J. S. SHEDLOCK. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

'This work should be in the possession of every musician and amateur, for it not only embodies a concise and lucid history of the origin of one of the most important forms of musical composition, but, by reason of the painstaking research and accuracy of the author's statements, it is a very valuable work for reference.'—*Athenæum*.

- E. M. Bowden.** THE EXAMPLE OF BUDDHA: Being Quotations from Buddhist Literature for each Day in the Year. Compiled by E. M. BOWDEN. With Preface by Sir EDWIN ARNOLD. *Third Edition.* 16mo. 2s. 6d.

- J. Beaver.** PRACTICAL FLY-FISHING, Founded on Nature, by JOHN BEEVER, late of the Thwaite House, Coniston. A New Edition, with a Memoir of the Author by W. G. COLLINGWOOD, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

A little book on Fly-Fishing by an old friend of Mr. Ruskin.

Science

- Freudenreich.** DAIRY BACTERIOLOGY. A Short Manual for the Use of Students. By Dr. ED. VON FREUDENREICH. Translated from the German by J. R. AINSWORTH DAVIS, B.A., F.C.P. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

- Chalmers Mitchell.** OUTLINES OF BIOLOGY. By P. CHALMERS MITCHELL, M.A., F.Z.S. *Fully Illustrated.* *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

A text-book designed to cover the new Schedule issued by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons.

- G. Massee.** A MONOGRAPH OF THE MYXOGASTRES. By GEORGE MASSEE. With 12 Coloured Plates. *Royal 8vo.* 18s. net.

'A work much in advance of any book in the language treating of this group of organisms. It is indispensable to every student of the Myxogastres. The coloured plates deserve high praise for their accuracy and execution.'—*Nature*.

Philosophy

- L. T. Hobhouse.** THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE. By L. T. HOBHOUSE, Fellow and Tutor of Corpus College, Oxford. *Demy 8vo.* 21s.

'The most important contribution to English philosophy since the publication of Mr. Bradley's "Appearance and Reality." Full of brilliant criticism and of positive theories which are models of lucid statement.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

An elaborate and often brilliantly written volume. The treatment is one of great freshness, and the illustrations are particularly numerous and apt.'—*Times*.

- W. H. Fairbrother.** THE PHILOSOPHY OF T. H. GREEN. By W. H. FAIRBROTHER, M.A., Lecturer at Lincoln College, Oxford. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

This volume is expository, not critical, and is intended for senior students at the Universities and others, as a statement of Green's teaching, and an introduction to the study of Idealist Philosophy.

'In every way an admirable book. As an introduction to the writings of perhaps the most remarkable speculative thinker whom England has produced in the present century, nothing could be better than Mr. Fairbrother's exposition and criticism.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

- F. W. Bussell.** THE SCHOOL OF PLATO: its Origin and its Revival under the Roman Empire. By F. W. BUSSELL, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. *Demy 8vo.* Two volumes. 7s. 6d. each. Vol. I.

'A highly valuable contribution to the history of ancient thought.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

'A clever and stimulating book, provocative of thought and deserving careful reading.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

- F. S. Granger.** THE WORSHIP OF THE ROMANS. By F. S. GRANGER, M.A., Litt.D., Professor of Philosophy at University College, Nottingham. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

The author has attempted to delineate that group of beliefs which stood in close connection with the Roman religion, and among the subjects treated are Dreams, Nature Worship, Roman Magic, Divination, Holy Places, Victims, etc. Thus the book is, apart from its immediate subject, a contribution to folk-lore and comparative psychology.

'A scholarly analysis of the religious ceremonies, beliefs, and superstitions of ancient Rome, conducted in the new instructive light of comparative anthropology.'—*Times*.

Theology

- E. C. S. Gibson.** THE XXXIX. ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Edited with an Introduction by E. C. S. GIBSON, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, late Principal of Wells Theological College. *In Two Volumes. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. each. Vol. I. Articles I.-VIII.*

'The tone maintained throughout is not that of the partial advocate, but the faithful exponent.'—*Scotsman*.

'There are ample proofs of clearness of expression, sobriety of judgment, and breadth of view. . . . The book will be welcome to all students of the subject, and its sound, definite, and loyal theology ought to be of great service.'—*National Observer*.

'So far from repelling the general reader, its orderly arrangement, lucid treatment, and felicity of diction invite and encourage his attention.'—*Yorkshire Post*.

- R. L. Ottley.** THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION. By R. L. OTTLEY, M.A., late fellow of Magdalen College, Oxon., Principal of Pusey House. *In Two Volumes. Demy 8vo. 15s.*

'Learned and reverent; lucid and well arranged.'—*Record*.

'Accurate, well ordered, and judicious.'—*National Observer*.

'A clear and remarkably full account of the main currents of speculation. Scholarly precision . . . genuine tolerance . . . intense interest in his subject—are Mr. Ottley's merits.'—*Guardian*.

- S. R. Driver.** SERMONS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'A welcome companion to the author's famous 'Introduction.' No man can read these discourses without feeling that Dr. Driver is fully alive to the deeper teaching of the Old Testament.'—*Guardian*.

- T. K. Cheyne.** FOUNDERS OF OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM: Biographical, Descriptive, and Critical Studies. By T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford. *Large crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

This important book is a historical sketch of O. T. Criticism in the form of biographical studies from the days of Eichhorn to those of Driver and Robertson Smith. It is the only book of its kind in English.

'A very learned and instructive work.'—*Times*.

- C. H. Prior.** CAMBRIDGE SERMONS. Edited by C. H. PRIOR, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Pembroke College. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

A volume of sermons preached before the University of Cambridge by various preachers, including the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop Westcott.

'A representative collection. Bishop Westcott's is a noble sermon.'—*Guardian*.

- H. C. Beeching.** SERMONS TO SCHOOLBOYS. By H. C. BEECHING, M.A., Rector of Yattendon, Berks. With a Preface by Canon SCOTT HOLLAND. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Seven sermons preached before the boys of Bradfield College.

E. B. Layard. RELIGION IN BOYHOOD. Notes on the Religious Training of Boys. With a Preface by J. R. ILLINGWORTH. By E. B. LAYARD, M.A. 18mo. 1s.

Devotional Books.

With Full-page Illustrations. Fcap. 8vo. Buckram. 3s. 6d.
Padded morocco, 5s.

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS À KEMPIS. With an Introduction by DEAN FARRAR. Illustrated by C. M. GERE, and printed in black and red. *Second Edition.*

'Amongst all the innumerable English editions of the "Imitation," there can have been few which were prettier than this one, printed in strong and handsome type by Messrs. Constable, with all the glory of red initials, and the comfort of buckram binding.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. By JOHN KEBLE. With an Introduction and Notes by W. LOCK, M.A., Sub-Warden of Keble College, Ireland Professor at Oxford, Author of the 'Life of John Keble.' Illustrated by R. ANNING BELL.

'The present edition is annotated with all the care and insight to be expected from Mr. Lock. The progress and circumstances of its composition are detailed in the Introduction. There is an interesting Appendix on the MSS. of the "Christian Year," and another giving the order in which the poems were written. A "Short Analysis of the Thought" is prefixed to each, and any difficulty in the text is explained in a note.'—*Guardian.*

'The most acceptable edition of this ever-popular work.'—*Globe.*

Leaders of Religion

Edited by H. C. BEECHING, M.A. *With Portraits, crown 8vo.*

A series of short biographies of the most prominent leaders of religious life and thought of all ages and countries.

The following are ready—

CARDINAL NEWMAN. By R. H. HUTTON.

JOHN WESLEY. By J. H. OVERTON, M.A.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE. By G. W. DANIEL, M.A.

CARDINAL MANNING. By A. W. HUTTON, M.A.

CHARLES SIMEON. By H. C. G. MOULE, M.A.

JOHN KEBLE. By WALTER LOCK, M.A.

THOMAS CHALMERS. By Mrs. OLIPHANT.

LANCELOT ANDREWES. By R. L. OTTLEY, M.A.

3/6

- AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY. By E. L. CUTTS, D.D.
 WILLIAM LAUD. By W. H. HUTTON, M.A.
 JOHN KNOX. By F. M'CUNN.
 JOHN HOWE. By R. F. HORTON, D.D.
 BISHOP KEN. By F. A. CLARKE, M.A.
 GEORGE FOX, THE QUAKER. By T. HODGKIN, D.C.L.

Other volumes will be announced in due course.

Fiction

SIX SHILLING NOVELS

Marie Corelli's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

- A ROMANCE OF TWO WORLDS. *Fourteenth Edition.*
 VENDETTA. *Eleventh Edition.*
 THELMA. *Fourteenth Edition.*
 ARDATH. *Tenth Edition.*
 THE SOUL OF LILITH. *Ninth Edition.*
 WORMWOOD. *Eighth Edition.*
 BARABBAS: A DREAM OF THE WORLD'S TRAGEDY.
Twenty-fifth Edition.

'The tender reverence of the treatment and the imaginative beauty of the writing have reconciled us to the daring of the conception, and the conviction is forced on us that even so exalted a subject cannot be made too familiar to us, provided it be presented in the true spirit of Christian faith. The amplifications of the Scripture narrative are often conceived with high poetic insight, and this "Dream of the World's Tragedy" is, despite some trifling incongruities, a lofty and not inadequate paraphrase of the supreme climax of the inspired narrative.'—*Dublin Review*.

- THE SORROWS OF SATAN. *Twenty-ninth Edition.*

'A very powerful piece of work. . . . The conception is magnificent, and is likely to win an abiding place within the memory of man. . . . The author has immense command of language, and a limitless audacity. . . . This interesting and remarkable romance will live long after much of the ephemeral literature of the day is forgotten. . . . A literary phenomenon . . . novel, and even sublime.'—W. T. STEAD in the *Review of Reviews*.

Anthony Hope's Novels*Crown 8vo. 6s. each.***THE GOD IN THE CAR. *Seventh Edition.***

'A very remarkable book, deserving of critical analysis impossible within our limit; brilliant, but not superficial; well considered, but not elaborated; constructed with the proverbial art that conceals, but yet allows itself to be enjoyed by readers to whom fine literary method is a keen pleasure; true without cynicism, subtle without affectation, humorous without strain, witty without offence, inevitably sad, with an unmorose simplicity.'—*The World*.

A CHANGE OF AIR. *Fourth Edition.*

'A graceful, vivacious comedy, true to human nature. The characters are traced with a masterly hand.'—*Times*.

A MAN OF MARK. *Third Edition.*

'Of all Mr. Hope's books, "A Man of Mark" is the one which best compares with "The Prisoner of Zenda." The two romances are unmistakably the work of the same writer, and he possesses a style of narrative peculiarly seductive, piquant, comprehensive, and—his own.'—*National Observer*.

THE CHRONICLES OF COUNT ANTONIO. *Third Edition.*

'It is a perfectly enchanting story of love and chivalry, and pure romance. The outlawed Count is the most constant, desperate, and withal modest and tender of lovers, a peerless gentleman, an intrepid fighter, a very faithful friend, and a most magnanimous foe. In short, he is an altogether admirable, lovable, and delightful hero. There is not a word in the volume that can give offence to the most fastidious taste of man or woman, and there is not, either, a dull paragraph in it. The book is everywhere instinct with the most exhilarating spirit of adventure, and delicately perfumed with the sentiment of all heroic and honourable deeds of history and romance.'—*Guardian*.

S. Baring Gould's Novels*Crown 8vo. 6s. each.*

'To say that a book is by the author of "Mehalah" is to imply that it contains a story cast on strong lines, containing dramatic possibilities, vivid and sympathetic descriptions of Nature, and a wealth of ingenious imagery.'—*Speaker*.

'That whatever Mr. Baring Gould writes is well worth reading, is a conclusion that may be very generally accepted. His views of life are fresh and vigorous, his language pointed and characteristic, the incidents of which he makes use are striking and original, his characters are life-like, and though somewhat exceptional people, are drawn and coloured with artistic force. Add to this that his descriptions of scenes and scenery are painted with the loving eyes and skilled hands of a master of his art, that he is always fresh and never dull, and under such conditions it is no wonder that readers have gained confidence both in his power of amusing and satisfying them, and that year by year his popularity widens.'—*Court Circular*.

ARMINELL: A Social Romance. *Fourth Edition.***URITH: A Story of Dartmoor. *Fourth Edition.***

'The author is at his best.'—*Times*.

'He has nearly reached the high water-mark of "Mehalah."'—*National Observer*.

IN THE ROAR OF THE SEA. *Fifth Edition.*

'One of the best imagined and most enthralling stories the author has produced.'
—*Saturday Review*.

MRS. CURGENVEN OF CURGENVEN. *Fourth Edition.*

'A novel of vigorous humour and sustained power.'—*Graphic*.
'The swing of the narrative is splendid.'—*Sussex Daily News*

CHEAP JACK ZITA. *Third Edition.*

'A powerful drama of human passion.'—*Westminster Gazette*.
'A story worthy the author.'—*National Observer*.

THE QUEEN OF LOVE. *Fourth Edition.*

'The scenery is admirable, and the dramatic incidents are most striking.'—*Glasgow Herald*.
'Strong, interesting, and clever.'—*Westminster Gazette*.
'You cannot put it down until you have finished it.'—*Punch*.
'Can be heartily recommended to all who care for cleanly, energetic, and interesting fiction.'—*Sussex Daily News*.

KITTY ALONE. *Fourth Edition.*

'A strong and original story, teeming with graphic description, stirring incident, and, above all, with vivid and enthralling human interest.'—*Daily Telegraph*.
'Brisk, clever, keen, healthy, humorous, and interesting.'—*National Observer*.
'Full of quaint and delightful studies of character.'—*Bristol Mercury*.

NOÉMI: A Romance of the Cave-Dwellers. Illustrated by
R. CATON WOODVILLE. *Third Edition.*

'"Noémi" is as excellent a tale of fighting and adventure as one may wish to meet. All the characters that interfere in this exciting tale are marked with properties of their own. The narrative also runs clear and sharp as the Loire itself.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
'Mr. Baring Gould's powerful story is full of the strong lights and shadows and vivid colouring to which he has accustomed us.'—*Standard*.

THE BROOM-SQUIRE. Illustrated by FRANK DADD.
Third Edition.

'A strain of tenderness is woven through the web of his tragic tale, and its atmosphere is sweetened by the nobility and sweetness of the heroine's character.'—*Daily News*.
'A story of exceptional interest that seems to us to be better than anything he has written of late.'—*Speaker*.
'A powerful and striking story.'—*Guardian*.
'A powerful piece of work.'—*Black and White*.

Gilbert Parker's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

PIERRE AND HIS PEOPLE. *Third Edition.*

'Stories happily conceived and finely executed. There is strength and genius in Mr. Parker's style.'—*Daily Telegraph*.

MRS. FALCHION. *Third Edition.*

'A splendid study of character.'—*Athenæum*.

'But little behind anything that has been done by any writer of our time.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

'A very striking and admirable novel.'—*St. James's Gazette*.

THE TRANSLATION OF A SAVAGE.

'The plot is original and one difficult to work out; but Mr. Parker has done it with great skill and delicacy. The reader who is not interested in this original, fresh, and well-told tale must be a dull person indeed.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

'A strong and successful piece of workmanship. The portrait of Lali, strong, dignified, and pure, is exceptionally well drawn.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

THE TRAIL OF THE SWORD. *Fourth Edition.*

'Everybody with a soul for romance will thoroughly enjoy "The Trail of the Sword."'—*St. James's Gazette*.

'A rousing and dramatic tale. A book like this, in which swords flash, great surprises are undertaken, and daring deeds done, in which men and women live and love in the old straightforward passionate way, is a joy inexpressible to the reviewer, brain-weary of the domestic tragedies and psychological puzzles of everyday fiction; and we cannot but believe that to the reader it will bring refreshment as welcome and as keen.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

WHEN VALMOND CAME TO PONTIAC: The Story of a Lost Napoleon. *Third Edition.*

'Here we find romance—real, breathing, living romance, but it runs flush with our own times, level with our own feelings. Not here can we complain of lack of inevitableness or homogeneity. The character of Valmond is drawn unerringly; his career, brief as it is, is placed before us as convincingly as history itself. The book must be read, we may say re-read, for any one thoroughly to appreciate Mr. Parker's delicate touch and innate sympathy with humanity.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

'The one work of genius which 1895 has as yet produced.'—*New Age*.

AN ADVENTURER OF THE NORTH: The Last Adventures of 'Pretty Pierre.'

'The present book is full of fine and moving stories of the great North, and it will add to Mr. Parker's already high reputation.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

'The new book is very romantic and very entertaining—full of that peculiarly elegant spirit of adventure which is so characteristic of Mr. Parker, and of that poetic thrill which has given him warmer, if less numerous, admirers than even his romantic story-telling gift has done.'—*Sketch*.

THE SEATS OF THE MIGHTY. *Illustrated. Fourth Edition.*

'The best thing he has done; one of the best things that any one has done lately.'—*St. James's Gazette*.

'Mr. Parker seems to become stronger and easier with every serious novel that he attempts. . . . In "The Seats of the Mighty" he shows the matured power which his former novels have led us to expect, and has produced a really fine historical novel. . . . The great creation of the book is Doltaire. . . . His character is drawn with quite masterly strokes, for he is a villain who is not altogether a villain, and who attracts the reader, as he did the other characters, by the extraordinary brilliance of his gifts, and by the almost unconscious acts of nobility which he performs. . . . Most sincerely is Mr. Parker to be congratulated on the finest novel he has yet written.'—*Athenæum*.

'Mr. Parker's latest book places him in the front rank of living novelists. "The Seats of the Mighty" is a great book.'—*Black and White*.

'One of the strongest stories of historical interest and adventure that we have read for many a day. . . . Through all Mr. Parker moves with an assured step, whilst in his treatment of his subject there is that happy blending of the poetical with the prosaic which has characterised all his writings. A notable and successful book.'—*Speaker*.

'The story is very finely and dramatically told. . . . In none of his books has his imaginative faculty appeared to such splendid purpose as here. Captain Moray, Alixe, Gabor, Vauban—above all, Doltaire—and, indeed, every person who takes part in the action of the story are clearly conceived and finely drawn and individualised.'—*Scotsman*.

'An admirable romance. The glory of a romance is its plot, and this plot is crowded with fine sensations, which have no rest until the fall of the famous old city and the final restitution of love.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

Conan Doyle. **ROUND THE RED LAMP.** By A. CONAN DOYLE, Author of 'The White Company,' 'The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes,' etc. *Fourth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

'The book is, indeed, composed of leaves from life, and is far and away the best view that has been vouchsafed us behind the scenes of the consulting-room. It is very superior to "The Diary of a late Physician."'—*Illustrated London News*.

Stanley Weyman. **UNDER THE RED ROBE.** By STANLEY WEYMAN, Author of 'A Gentleman of France.' With Twelve Illustrations by R. Caton Woodville. *Eighth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

'A book of which we have read every word for the sheer pleasure of reading, and which we put down with a pang that we cannot forget it all and start again.'—*Westminster Gazette*.

'Every one who reads books at all must read this thrilling romance, from the first page of which to the last the breathless reader is haled along. An inspiration of "manliness and courage."—*Daily Chronicle*.

'A delightful tale of chivalry and adventure, vivid and dramatic, with a wholesome modesty and reverence for the highest.'—*Globe*.

Mrs. Clifford. **A FLASH OF SUMMER.** By MRS. W. K. CLIFFORD, Author of 'Aunt Anne,' etc. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

'The story is a very sad and a very beautiful one, exquisitely told, and enriched with many subtle touches of wise and tender insight. It will, undoubtedly, add to its author's reputation—already high—in the ranks of novelists.'—*Speaker*.

'We must congratulate Mrs. Clifford upon a very successful and interesting story, told throughout with finish and a delicate sense of proportion, qualities which, indeed, have always distinguished the best work of this very able writer.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

Emily Lawless. **HURRISH.** By the Honble. EMILY LAWLESS, Author of 'Maelcho,' etc. *Fifth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.
A reissue of Miss Lawless' most popular novel, uniform with 'Maelcho.'

Emily Lawless. **MAELCHO: a Sixteenth Century Romance.** By the Honble. EMILY LAWLESS, Author of 'Grania,' 'Hurrish,' etc. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

'A really great book.'—*Spectator*.

'There is no keener pleasure in life than the recognition of genius. Good work is commoner than it used to be, but the best is as rare as ever. All the more gladly, therefore, do we welcome in "Maelcho" a piece of work of the first order, which we do not hesitate to describe as one of the most remarkable literary achievements of this generation. Miss Lawless is possessed of the very essence of historical genius.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

J. H. Findlater. THE GREEN GRAVES OF BALGOWRIE.By JANE H. FINDLATER. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

- 'A powerful and vivid story.'—*Standard*.
- 'A beautiful story, sad and strange as truth itself.'—*Vanity Fair*.
- 'A work of remarkable interest and originality.'—*National Observer*.
- 'A really original novel.'—*Journal of Education*.
- 'A very charming and pathetic tale.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
- 'A singularly original, clever, and beautiful story.'—*Guardian*.
- '"The Green Graves of Balgowrie" reveals to us a new Scotch writer of undoubted faculty and reserve force.'—*Spectator*.
- 'An exquisite idyll, delicate, affecting, and beautiful.'—*Black and White*.
- 'Permeated with high and noble purpose. It is one of the most wholesome stories we have met with, and cannot fail to leave a deep and lasting impression.'—*Newsagent*.

E. F. Benson. DODO: A DETAIL OF THE DAY. By E. F.BENSON. *Sixteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

- 'A delightfully witty sketch of society.'—*Spectator*.
- 'A perpetual feast of epigram and paradox.'—*Speaker*.
- 'By a writer of quite exceptional ability.'—*Athenæum*.
- 'Brilliantly written.'—*World*.

E. F. Benson. THE RUBICON. By E. F. BENSON, Author of'Dodo.' *Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

- 'Well written, stimulating, unconventional, and, in a word, characteristic.'—*Birmingham Post*.
- 'An exceptional achievement; a notable advance on his previous work.'—*National Observer*.

M. M. Dowie. GALLIA. By MÉNIE MURIEL DOWIE, Author of 'A Girl in the Carpathians.' *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

- 'The style is generally admirable, the dialogue not seldom brilliant, the situations surprising in their freshness and originality, while the subsidiary as well as the principal characters live and move, and the story itself is readable from title-page to colophon.'—*Saturday Review*.
- 'A very notable book; a very sympathetically, at times delightfully written book.'—*Daily Graphic*.

Mrs. Oliphant. SIR ROBERT'S FORTUNE. By MRS. OLIPHANT. Crown 8vo. 6s.

- 'Full of her own peculiar charm of style and simple, subtle character-painting come her new gift, the delightful story before us. The scene mostly lies in the moors, and at the touch of the authoress a Scotch moor becomes a living thing, strong tender, beautiful, and changeful.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

Mrs. Oliphant. THE TWO MARYS. By MRS. OLIPHANT. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.**W. E. Norris. MATTHEW AUSTIN. By W. E. NORRIS, Author of 'Mademoiselle de Mersac,' etc. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.**

- '"Matthew Austin" may safely be pronounced one of the most intellectually satisfactory and morally bracing novels of the current year.'—*Daily Telegraph*.

W. E. Norris. HIS GRACE. By W. E. NORRIS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

- 'Mr. Norris has drawn a really fine character in the Duke of Hurstbourne, at once unconventional and very true to the conventionalities of life, weak and strong in a breath, capable of inane follies and heroic decisions, yet not so definitely portrayed as to relieve a reader of the necessity of study.'—*Athenæum*.

W. E. Norris. THE DESPOTIC LADY AND OTHERS.By W. E. NORRIS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*'A budget of good fiction of which no one will tire.'—*Scotsman.*'An extremely entertaining volume—the sprightliest of holiday companions.'—*Daily Telegraph***H. G. Wells. THE STOLEN BACILLUS, and other Stories.**By H. G. WELLS, Author of 'The Time Machine.' *Crown 8vo. 6s.*'The ordinary reader of fiction may be glad to know that these stories are eminently readable from one cover to the other, but they are more than that; they are the impressions of a very striking imagination, which, it would seem, has a great deal within its reach.'—*Saturday Review.***Arthur Morrison. TALES OF MEAN STREETS.** By ARTHURMORRISON. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*'Told with consummate art and extraordinary detail. He tells a plain, unvarnished tale, and the very truth of it makes for beauty. In the true humanity of the book lies its justification, the permanence of its interest, and its indubitable triumph.'—*Athenæum.*'A great book. The author's method is amazingly effective, and produces a thrilling sense of reality. The writer lays upon us a master hand. The book is simply appalling and irresistible in its interest. It is humorous also; without humour it would not make the mark it is certain to make.'—*World.***J. Maclaren Cobban. THE KING OF ANDAMAN: A**Saviour of Society. By J. MACLAREN COBBAN, Author of 'The Red Sultan,' etc. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*'An unquestionably interesting book. It would not surprise us if it turns out to be the most interesting novel of the season, for it contains one character, at least, who has in him the root of immortality, and the book itself is ever exhaling the sweet savour of the unexpected. . . . Plot is forgotten and incident fades, and only the really human endures, and throughout this book there stands out in bold and beautiful relief its high-souled and chivalric protagonist, James the Master of Hutcheon, the King of Andaman himself.'—*Fall Mail Gazette.*'A most original and refreshing story. James Hutcheon is a personage whom it is good to know and impossible to forget. He is beautiful within and without, whichever way we take him.'—*Spectator.*'"The King of Andaman," is a book which does credit not less to the heart than the head of its author.'—*Athenæum.*'The fact that Her Majesty the Queen has been pleased to gracefully express to the author of "The King of Andaman" her interest in his work will doubtless find for it many readers.'—*Vanity Fair.***H. Morrah. A SERIOUS COMEDY.** By HERBERT MORRAH.*Crown 8vo. 6s.*'There are many delightful places in this volume, which is well worthy of its title. The theme has seldom been presented with more freshness or more force.'—*Scotsman.***L. B. Walford. SUCCESSORS TO THE TITLE.** By MRS.WALFORD, Author of 'Mr. Smith,' etc. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*'The story is fresh and healthy from beginning to finish; and our liking for the two simple people who are the successors to the title mounts steadily, and ends almost in respect.'—*Scotsman.*'The book is quite worthy to be ranked with many clever predecessors. It is excellent reading.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

T. L. Paton. A HOME IN INVERESK. By T. L. PATON.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

'A distinctly fresh and fascinating novel.'—*Montrose Standard*.

'A book which bears marks of considerable promise.'—*Scotsman*.

'A pleasant and well-written story.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

John Davidson. MISS ARMSTRONG'S AND OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES. By JOHN DAVIDSON. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'Throughout the volume there is a strong vein of originality, a strength in the handling, and a knowledge of human nature that are worthy of the highest praise.'—*Scotsman*.

J. B. Burton. IN THE DAY OF ADVERSITY. By J. BLOUNDELLE BURTON, Author of 'The Hispaniola Plate,' etc. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'Unusually interesting and full of highly dramatic situations.'—*Guardian*.

'A well-written story, drawn from that inexhaustible mine, the time of Louis XIV.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

H. Johnston. DR. CONGALTON'S LEGACY. By HENRY JOHNSTON. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'The story is redolent of humour, pathos, and tenderness, while it is not without a touch of tragedy.'—*Scotsman*.

A worthy and permanent contribution to Scottish creative literature.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

Julian Corbett. A BUSINESS IN GREAT WATERS. By JULIAN CORBETT, Author of 'For God and Gold,' 'Kophetua XIIIth,' etc. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'In this stirring story Mr. Julian Corbett has done excellent work, welcome alike for its distinctly literary flavour, and for the wholesome tone which pervades it. Mr. Corbett writes with immense spirit, and the book is a thoroughly enjoyable one in all respects. The salt of the ocean is in it, and the right heroic ring resounds through its gallant adventures.'—*Speaker*.

C. Phillips Woolley. THE QUEENSBERRY CUP. A Tale of Adventure. By CLIVE PHILLIPS WOOLLEY, Author of 'Snap,' Editor of 'Big Game Shooting.' *Illustrated. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'A book which will delight boys: a book which upholds the healthy schoolboy code of morality.'—*Scotsman*.

'A brilliant book. Dick St. Clair, of Caithness, is an almost ideal character—a combination of the mediæval knight and the modern pugilist.'—*Admiralty and Horse-guards Gazette*.

Robert Barr. IN THE MIDST OF ALARMS. By ROBERT BARR, Author of 'From Whose Bourne,' etc. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

'A book which has abundantly satisfied us by its capital humour.'—*Daily Chronicle*.

'Mr. Barr has achieved a triumph whereof he has every reason to be proud.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

L. Daintrey. THE KING OF ALBERIA. A Romance of the Balkans. By LAURA DAINTREY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Miss Daintrey seems to have an intimate acquaintance with the people and politics of the Balkan countries in which the scene of her lively and picturesque romance is laid. On almost every page we find clever touches of local colour which differentiate her book unmistakably from the ordinary novel of commerce. The story is briskly told, and well conceived.'—*Glasgow Herald*.

- Mrs. Pinsent.** CHILDREN OF THIS WORLD. By ELLEN F. PINSENT, Author of 'Jenny's Case.' *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
 'Mrs. Pinsent's new novel has plenty of vigour, variety, and good writing. There are certainty of purpose, strength of touch, and clearness of vision.'—*Athenæum*.
- Clark Russell.** MY DANISH SWEETHEART. By W. CLARK RUSSELL, Author of 'The Wreck of the Grosvenor,' etc. *Illustrated. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
- G. Manville Fenn.** AN ELECTRIC SPARK. By G. MANVILLE FENN, Author of 'The Vicar's Wife,' 'A Double Knot,' etc. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
 'A simple and wholesome story.'—*Manchester Guardian*.
- R. Pryce.** TIME AND THE WOMAN. By RICHARD PRYCE, Author of 'Miss Maxwell's Affections,' 'The Quiet Mrs. Fleming,' etc. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
 'Mr. Pryce's work recalls the style of Octave Feuillet, by its clearness, conciseness, its literary reserve.'—*Athenæum*.
- Mrs. Watson.** THIS MAN'S DOMINION. By the Author of 'A High Little World.' *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
- Marriott Watson.** DIOGENES OF LONDON and other Sketches. By H. B. MARRIOTT WATSON, Author of 'The Web of the Spider.' *Crown 8vo. Buckram.* 6s.
 'By all those who delight in the uses of words, who rate the exercise of prose above the exercise of verse, who rejoice in all proofs of its delicacy and its strength, who believe that English prose is chief among the moulds of thought, by these Mr. Marriott Watson's book will be welcomed.'—*National Observer*.
- M. Gilchrist.** THE STONE DRAGON. By MURRAY GILCHRIST. *Crown 8vo. Buckram.* 6s.
 'The author's faults are atoned for by certain positive and admirable merits. The romances have not their counterpart in modern literature, and to read them is a unique experience.'—*National Observer*.
- E. Dickinson.** A VICAR'S WIFE. By EVELYN DICKINSON. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
- E. M. Gray.** ELSA. By E. M'QUEEN GRAY. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THREE-AND-SIXPENNY NOVELS

Crown 8vo.

3/6

- DERRICK VAUGHAN, NOVELIST. By EDNA LYALL.
- MARGERY OF QUETHER. By S. BARING GOULD.
- JACQUETTA. By S. BARING GOULD.
- SUBJECT TO VANITY. By MARGARET BENSON.
- THE MOVING FINGER. By MARY GAUNT.
- JACO TRELOAR. By J. H. PEARCE.

- AUT DIABOLUS AUT NIHIL. By X. L.
 THE COMING OF CUCULAIN. A Romance of the Heroic Age of Ireland. By STANDISH O'GRADY. *Illustrated.*
 THE GODS GIVE MY DONKEY WINGS. By ANGUS EVAN ABBOTT.
 THE STAR GAZERS. By G. MANVILLE FENN.
 THE POISON OF ASPS. By R. ORTON PROWSE.
 THE QUIET MRS. FLEMING. By R. PRYCE.
 THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN. By F. MABEL ROBINSON.
 DISENCHANTMENT. By F. MABEL ROBINSON.
 MR. BUTLER'S WARD. By F. MABEL ROBINSON.
 A LOST ILLUSION. By LESLIE KEITH.
 A REVEREND GENTLEMAN. By J. M. COBBAN.
 A DEPLORABLE AFFAIR. By W. E. NORRIS.
 A CAVALIER'S LADYE. By Mrs. DICKER.

HALF-CROWN NOVELS

A Series of Novels by popular Authors.

2/6

1. HOVENDEN, V.C. By F. MABEL ROBINSON.
2. ELI'S CHILDREN. By G. MANVILLE FENN.
3. A DOUBLE KNOT. By G. MANVILLE FENN.
4. DISARMED. By M. BETHAM EDWARDS.
5. A MARRIAGE AT SEA. By W. CLARK RUSSELL.
6. IN TENT AND BUNGALOW. By the Author of 'Indian Idylls.'
7. MY STEWARDSHIP. By E. M'QUEEN GRAY.
8. JACK'S FATHER. By W. E. NORRIS.
9. JIM B.

Lynn Linton. THE TRUE HISTORY OF JOSHUA DAVIDSON, Christian and Communist. By E. LYNN LINTON. *Eleventh Edition. Post 8vo. 1s.*

Books for Boys and Girls

A Series of Books by well-known Authors, well illustrated.

3/6

1. THE ICELANDER'S SWORD. By S. BARING GOULD.
2. TWO LITTLE CHILDREN AND CHING. By EDITH E. CUTHELL.

3. TODDLEREN'S HERO. By M. M. BLAKE.
4. ONLY A GUARD ROOM DOG. By EDITH E. CUTHELL.
5. THE DOCTOR OF THE JULIET. By HARRY COLLINGWOOD.
6. MASTER ROCKAFELLAR'S VOYAGE. By W. CLARK RUSSELL.
7. SYD BELTON: Or, The Boy who would not go to Sea. By G. MANVILLE FENN.

The Peacock Library

A Series of Books for Girls by well-known Authors, handsomely bound in blue and silver, and well illustrated.

3/6

1. A PINCH OF EXPERIENCE. By L. B. WOLFORD.
2. THE RED GRANGE. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH.
3. THE SECRET OF MADAME DE MONLUC. By the Author of 'Mlle Mori.'
4. DUMPS. By Mrs. PARR, Author of 'Adam and Eve.'
5. OUT OF THE FASHION. By L. T. MEADE.
6. A GIRL OF THE PEOPLE. By L. T. MEADE.
7. HEPSY GIPSY. By L. T. MEADE. 2s. 6d.
8. THE HONOURABLE MISS. By L. T. MEADE.
9. MY LAND OF BEULAH. By Mrs. LEITH ADAMS.

University Extension Series

A series of books on historical, literary, and scientific subjects, suitable for extension students and home-reading circles. Each volume is complete in itself, and the subjects are treated by competent writers in a broad and philosophic spirit.

Edited by J. E. SYMES, M.A.,
Principal of University College, Nottingham.
Crown 8vo. Price (with some exceptions) 2s. 6d.

The following volumes are ready:—

THE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A., late Scholar of Wadham College, Oxon., Cobden Prizeman. *Fourth Edition. With Maps and Plans.* 3s.

'A compact and clear story of our industrial development. A study of this concise but luminous book cannot fail to give the reader a clear insight into the principal phenomena of our industrial history. The editor and publishers are to be congratulated on this first volume of their venture, and we shall look with expectant interest for the succeeding volumes of the series.'—*University Extension Journal.*

- A HISTORY OF ENGLISH POLITICAL ECONOMY. By
L. L. PRICE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxon. *Second Edition.*
- PROBLEMS OF POVERTY: An Inquiry into the Industrial
Conditions of the Poor. By J. A. HOBSON, M.A. *Third Edition.*
- VICTORIAN POETS. By A. SHARP.
- THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. By J. E. SYMES, M.A.
- PSYCHOLOGY. By F. S. GRANGER, M.A., Lecturer in Philo-
sophy at University College, Nottingham.
- THE EVOLUTION OF PLANT LIFE: Lower Forms. By
G. MASSEE, Kew Gardens. *With Illustrations.*
- AIR AND WATER. Professor V. B. LEWES, M.A. *Illustrated.*
- THE CHEMISTRY OF LIFE AND HEALTH. By C. W.
KIMMINS, M.A. Camb. *Illustrated.*
- THE MECHANICS OF DAILY LIFE. By V. P. SELLS, M.A.
Illustrated.
- ENGLISH SOCIAL REFORMERS. H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A.
- ENGLISH TRADE AND FINANCE IN THE SEVEN-
TEENTH CENTURY. By W. A. S. HEWINS, B.A.
- THE CHEMISTRY OF FIRE. The Elementary Principles of
Chemistry. By M. M. PATTISON MUIR, M.A. *Illustrated.*
- A TEXT-BOOK OF AGRICULTURAL BOTANY. By M. C.
POTTER, M.A., F.L.S. *Illustrated.* 3s. 6d.
- THE VAULT OF HEAVEN. A Popular Introduction to
Astronomy. By R. A. GREGORY. *With numerous Illustrations.*
- METEOROLOGY. The Elements of Weather and Climate.
By H. N. DICKSON, F.R.S.E., F.R. Met. Soc. *Illustrated.*
- A MANUAL OF ELECTRICAL SCIENCE. By GEORGE
J. BURCH, M.A. *With numerous Illustrations.* 3s.
- THE EARTH. An Introduction [to Physiography. By EVAN
SMALL, M.A. *Illustrated.*
- INSECT LIFE. By F. W. THEOBALD, M.A. *Illustrated.*
- ENGLISH POETRY FROM BLAKE TO BROWNING. By
W. M. DIXON, M.A.
- ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. By E. JENKS, M.A.,
Professor of Law at University College, Liverpool.

Social Questions of To-day

Edited by H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A.

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

2/6

A series of volumes upon those topics of social, economic, and industrial interest that are at the present moment foremost in the public mind. Each volume of the series is written by an author who is an acknowledged authority upon the subject with which he deals.

The following Volumes of the Series are ready :—

- TRADE UNIONISM—NEW AND OLD. By G. HOWELL,
Author of 'The Conflicts of Capital and Labour.' *Second Edition.*
- THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT TO-DAY. By G. J.
HOLYOAKE, Author of 'The History of Co-operation.' *Second Edition.*
- MUTUAL THRIFT. By Rev. J. FROME WILKINSON, M.A.,
Author of 'The Friendly Society Movement.'
- PROBLEMS OF POVERTY : An Inquiry into the Industrial
Conditions of the Poor. By J. A. HOBSON, M.A. *Third Edition.*
- THE COMMERCE OF NATIONS. By C. F. BASTABLE,
M.A., Professor of Economics at Trinity College, Dublin.
- THE ALIEN INVASION. By W. H. WILKINS, B.A., Secretary
to the Society for Preventing the Immigration of Destitute Aliens.
- THE RURAL EXODUS. By P. ANDERSON GRAHAM.
- LAND NATIONALIZATION. By HAROLD COX, B.A.
- A SHORTER WORKING DAY. By H. DE B. GIBBINS
and R. A. HADFIELD, of the Hecla Works, Sheffield.
- BACK TO THE LAND : An Inquiry into the Cure for Rural
Depopulation. By H. E. MOORE.
- TRUSTS, POOLS AND CORNERS : As affecting Commerce
and Industry. By J. STEPHEN JEANS, M.R.I., F.S.S.
- THE FACTORY SYSTEM. By R. COOKE TAYLOR.
- THE STATE AND ITS CHILDREN. By GERTRUDE
TUCKWELL.
- WOMEN'S WORK. By LADY DILKE, MISS BULLEY, and
MISS WHITLEY.

MUNICIPALITIES AT WORK. The Municipal Policy of Six Great Towns, and its Influence on their Social Welfare. By FREDERICK DOLMAN.

SOCIALISM AND MODERN THOUGHT. By M. KAUFMANN.

THE HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES. By R. F. BOWMAKER.

MODERN CIVILISATION IN SOME OF ITS ECONOMIC ASPECTS. By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Classical Translations

Edited by H. F. FOX, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford.

Messrs. Methuen are issuing a New Series of Translations from the Greek and Latin Classics. They have enlisted the services of some of the best Oxford and Cambridge Scholars, and it is their intention that the Series shall be distinguished by literary excellence as well as by scholarly accuracy.

ÆSCHYLUS—Agamemnon, Chœphorœ, Eumenides. Translated by LEWIS CAMPBELL, LL.D., late Professor of Greek at St. Andrews. 5s.

CICERO—De Oratore I. Translated by E. N. P. MOOR, M.A., Assistant Master at Clifton. 3s. 6d.

CICERO—Select Orations (Pro Milone, Pro Murena, Philippic II., In Catilinam). Translated by H. E. D. BLAKISTON, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. 5s.

CICERO—De Natura Deorum. Translated by F. BROOKS, M.A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. 3s. 6d.

LUCIAN—Six Dialogues (Nigrinus, Icaro-Menippus, The Cock, The Ship, The Parasite, The Lover of Falsehood). Translated by S. T. IRWIN, M.A., Assistant Master at Clifton; late Scholar of Exeter College, Oxford. 3s. 6d.

SOPHOCLES—Electra and Ajax. Translated by E. D. A. MORSHEAD, M.A., late Scholar of New College, Oxford; Assistant Master at Winchester. 2s. 6d.

TACITUS—Agricola and Germania. Translated by R. B. TOWNSHEND, late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. 2s. 6d.

Educational Books

CLASSICAL

TACITI AGRICOLA. With Introduction, Notes, Map, etc.
By R. F. DAVIS, M.A., Assistant Master at Weymouth College.
Crown 8vo. 2s.

TACITI GERMANIA. By the same Editor. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*

HERODOTUS: EASY SELECTIONS. With Vocabulary.
By A. C. LIDDELL, M.A., Assistant Master at Nottingham High School. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

SELECTIONS FROM THE ODYSSEY. By E. D. STONE, M.A., late Assistant Master at Eton. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

PLAUTUS: THE CAPTIV. Adapted for Lower Forms by J. H. FREERE, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge. *1s. 6d.*

DEMOSTHENES AGAINST CONON AND CALLICLES.
Edited with Notes, and Vocabulary, by F. DARWIN SWIFT, M.A., formerly Scholar of Queen's College, Oxford; Assistant Master at Denstone College. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s.*

GERMAN

A COMPANION GERMAN GRAMMAR. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A., Assistant Master at Nottingham High School.
Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

GERMAN PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION.
By E. M'QUEEN GRAY. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

SCIENCE

THE WORLD OF SCIENCE. Including Chemistry, Heat, Light, Sound, Magnetism, Electricity, Botany, Zoology, Physiology, Astronomy, and Geology. By R. ELLIOT STEEL, M.A., F.C.S.
147 Illustrations. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

'Mr. Steel's Manual is admirable in many ways. The book is well calculated to attract and retain the attention of the young.'—*Saturday Review*.

'If Mr. Steel is to be placed second to any for this quality of lucidity, it is only to Huxley himself; and to be named in the same breath with this master of the craft of teaching is to be accredited with the clearness of style and simplicity of arrangement that belong to thorough mastery of a subject.'—*Parents' Review*.

ELEMENTARY LIGHT. By R. E. STEEL. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

ENGLISH

ENGLISH RECORDS. A Companion to the History of England. By H. E. MALDEN, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

A book which aims at concentrating information upon dates, genealogy, officials, constitutional documents, etc., which is usually found scattered in different volumes.

THE ENGLISH CITIZEN: HIS RIGHTS AND DUTIES. By H. E. MALDEN, M.A. 1s. 6d.

'The book goes over the same ground as is traversed in the school books on this subject written to satisfy the requirements of the Education code. It would serve admirably the purposes of a text-book, as it is well based in historical facts, and keeps quite clear of party matters.'—*Scotsman*.

METHUEN'S COMMERCIAL SERIES.

Edited by H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A.

BRITISH COMMERCE AND COLONIES FROM ELIZABETH TO VICTORIA. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A., Author of 'The Industrial History of England,' etc. etc. 2s.

COMMERCIAL EXAMINATION PAPERS. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A. 1s. 6d.

THE ECONOMICS OF COMMERCE. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A. 1s. 6d.

A MANUAL OF FRENCH COMMERCIAL CORRESPONDENCE. By S. E. BALLY, Modern Language Master at the Manchester Grammar School. 2s.

A FRENCH COMMERCIAL READER. By S. E. BALLY. 2s.

COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY, with special reference to Trade Routes, New Markets, and Manufacturing Districts. By L. W. LYDE, M.A., of the Academy, Glasgow. 2s.

A PRIMER OF BUSINESS. By S. JACKSON, M.A. 1s. 6d.

COMMERCIAL ARITHMETIC. By F. G. TAYLOR, M.A. 1s. 6d.

WORKS BY A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A.

INITIA LATINA: Easy Lessons on Elementary Accidence.
Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

FIRST LATIN LESSONS. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s.*

FIRST LATIN READER. With Notes adapted to the
Shorter Latin Primer and Vocabulary. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.*
1s. 6d.

EASY SELECTIONS FROM CAESAR. Part I. The Hel-
vetian War. *18mo. 1s.*

EASY SELECTIONS FROM LIVY. Part I. The Kings of
Rome. *18mo. 1s. 6d.*

EASY LATIN PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLA-
TION. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

EXEMPLA LATINA. First Lessons in Latin Accidence.
With Vocabulary. *Crown 8vo. 1s.*

EASY LATIN EXERCISES ON THE SYNTAX OF THE
SHORTER AND REVISED LATIN PRIMER. With Vocabu-
lary. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.* Issued with the con-
sent of Dr. Kennedy.

THE LATIN COMPOUND SENTENCE: Rules and
Exercises. *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.* With Vocabulary. *2s.*

NOTANDA QUAEDAM: Miscellaneous Latin Exercises on
Common Rules and Idioms. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
With Vocabulary, *2s.*

LATIN VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION: Arranged
according to Subjects. *Fourth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

A VOCABULARY OF LATIN IDIOMS AND PHRASES.
18mo. 1s.

STEPS TO GREEK. *18mo. 1s.*

EASY GREEK PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLA-
TION. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

GREEK VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION. Arranged
according to Subjects. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

GREEK TESTAMENT SELECTIONS. For the use of
Schools. *Third Edition.* With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabu-
lary. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

STEPS TO FRENCH. 18mo. 8d.

FIRST FRENCH LESSONS. Crown 8vo. 1s.

EASY FRENCH PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

EASY FRENCH EXERCISES ON ELEMENTARY SYNTAX. With Vocabulary. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

FRENCH VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION : Arranged according to Subjects. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

SCHOOL EXAMINATION SERIES.

EDITED BY A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A.

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

FRENCH EXAMINATION PAPERS IN MISCELLANEOUS GRAMMAR AND IDIOMS. By A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A. *Sixth Edition.*

A KEY, issued to Tutors and Private Students only, to be had on application to the Publishers. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

LATIN EXAMINATION PAPERS IN MISCELLANEOUS GRAMMAR AND IDIOMS. By A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* KEY issued as above. 6s. net.

GREEK EXAMINATION PAPERS IN MISCELLANEOUS GRAMMAR AND IDIOMS. By A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A. *Third Edition.* KEY issued as above. 6s. net.

GERMAN EXAMINATION PAPERS IN MISCELLANEOUS GRAMMAR AND IDIOMS. By R. J. MORICH, Manchester. *Third Edition.* KEY issued as above. 6s. net.

HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY EXAMINATION PAPERS. By C. H. SPENCE, M.A., Clifton Coll.

SCIENCE EXAMINATION PAPERS. By R. E. STEEL, M.A., F.C.S., Chief Natural Science Master, Bradford Grammar School. *In two vols.* Part I. Chemistry ; Part II. Physics.

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE EXAMINATION PAPERS. By A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A. *Second Edition.* KEY issued as above. 7s. net.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press



KU-997-603

